

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

A Platform for the Free Discussion of
Issues in the Field of Religion and
Their Bearing on Education

JULY-SEPTEMBER, 1941



A Fellowship and Its Journal

Intercultural Education

Religion on the College Campus

Laboratories of Democracy

I Graduate from Seminary

Comments by *John G. Craig, Albert W. Palmer, James S. Chubb, and
Luther A. Weigle*

Annual Meeting of the Religious Education Association

Book Reviews and Notes

The Editor

Stewart G. Cole

Arthur L. Frederick

Hedley S. Dimock

Anonymous

Religious Education

Seeks to present, on an adequate, scientific plane, those factors which make for improvement in religious and moral education. The Journal does not defend particular points of view, contributors alone being responsible for opinions expressed in their articles. It gives its authors entire freedom of expression, without official endorsement of any sort.

Articles in *Religious Education* are indexed in the EDUCATION INDEX, which is on file in educational institutions and public libraries.

Membership in the Association is \$4.00 or more per year, of which \$3.50 is for subscription to the Journal. Single copies, \$1.00 each.

LAIRD T. HITES, Editor

*Department of Psychology and Education,
Central YMCA College, Chicago*

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

FRANK M. MCKIBBEN, *Professor of
Religious Education, Northwestern
University, Chairman.*

RUFUS D. BOWMAN, *President, Beth-
any Biblical Seminary, Chicago.*

HEDLEY S. DIMOCK, *Dean, George
Williams College, Chicago.*

PERCY R. HAYWARD, *Chairman of Edi-
torial Board, International Council
of Religious Education, Chicago.*

LEO L. HONOR, *Executive Secretary,
Board of Jewish Education, Chicago.*

REGINA WESTCOTT WIEMAN, *Consult-
ing Psychologist and Lecturer, Chi-
cago.*

The Religious Education Association

Publication Office, 404 N. Wesley Ave., Mount Morris, Ill.
Editorial Office, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Illinois

(Address all correspondence to the Editorial office)

Published quarterly. Printed in U.S.A.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

VOLUME XXXVI

JULY-SEPTEMBER, 1941

NUMBER 3

CONTENTS

	Page
A Fellowship and Its Journal..... <i>The Editor</i>	130
Intercultural Education..... <i>Stewart G. Cole</i>	131
Religion on the College Campus..... <i>Arthur L. Frederick</i>	145
Laboratories of Democracy..... <i>Hedley S. Dimock</i>	153
I Graduate from Seminary..... <i>Anonymous</i>	163
Comments by— <i>John G. Craig, Albert W. Palmer, James S. Chubb,</i> <i>and Luther A. Weigle</i>	166
Annual Meeting of the Religious Education Association.....	175
Book Reviews and Notes.....	182

Entered as second-class matter July 31, 1935, at the post office at Mount Morris, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

A FELLOWSHIP AND ITS JOURNAL

THIS story is about an English merchant. For a long time he had moved along the even tenor of his ways, undisturbed by progress, when unexpectedly a vigorous young competitor opened shop across the street. Leaning back on his dignity and prestige, the Englishman added to the sign above his door, "Established Fifty Years." Promptly his competitor countered with a larger sign which read, "Established Yesterday, All New Stock."

The Religious Education Association has the dignity and the prestige of an established, on-going concern. It is now thirty-eight years old. Constantly, however, it has criticized its wares; its stock in trade is always new. Its members are not content merely to "keep up with the times"; pioneers, they have consistently gone ahead of their times, and pointed to the future.

Professors from Yale and Harvard, from Ohio and Chicago, from Wisconsin and Denver and Los Angeles—and from Oregon and Texas and Florida and all points between—have joined hands in this fellowship with progressive ministers of all churches, Protestant, Catholic and Jewish; with editors of religious and educational and social journals; and with directors of religious education.* They have a two-fold purpose in view:

**"To inspire the religious forces of our country with the educational ideal;
and to inspire the educational forces of our country
with the religious ideal."**

Working at the frontiers of their respective tasks, these men and women have sensed the need of that inter-stimulation which can come only from contact with kindred minds. As a result, many hundreds of them have united in the fellowship of the Religious Education Association. They come together in a dozen regional chapters and in an Annual Meeting. They compare notes, exchange ideas, think together on frontier problems, and then go back to work and to pioneer some more.

They publish a Journal—a good Journal, RELIGIOUS EDUCATION, of which this is an example. For several years past it has appeared quarterly, but beginning next January, *there will be six issues a year.*

Through its Journal, in its meetings, and in other ways, the Association has been working carefully on the inter-relationships possible between religious education and public education. Broadening the scope a little, its theme becomes, "The Meaning and Place of Religion in the Total Educational Experience of Children, Youth, and Adults."

The members of the Association have long felt that American schools, public and private, elementary and higher, have too dangerously neglected religion, and in consequence that American youth has become seriously neglectful of the most stabilizing values in life. "To inspire the educational forces of our country with the religious ideal" will, therefore, be the keynote of our Journal's program for 1942.

About half the college and university libraries in the United States have files of RELIGIOUS EDUCATION on their shelves. We are eager that the number shall increase, so that students and teachers in all fields of learning shall have access to wholesome thinking on this important area of American life.

The Association will become stronger as more people enter its fellowship—thoughtful, pioneering people preferred, who are working at important educational tasks.

LAIRD T. HITES, *Editor.*

*Observe the names of some of the Association's members on the covers of this Journal.

INTERCULTURAL EDUCATION*

STEWART G. COLE**

I. OUTLINES OF THE PROBLEM

AMERICANS are more united in their loyalty to the public school than to any other institution in this country. This is not difficult to understand. As the idea of democracy grew and men became imbued with its fervor, they sensed that education and popular government were the primary instruments of its preservation. The phrase "education for democracy" has become a familiar slogan to all who identify school interests with those of "the American way." This viewpoint has never been more widely accepted among us than it is today when the forces of democracy are threatened by totalitarian thrusts from many quarters. The best education for long-range national defense, most Americans are convinced, is more democracy. But not all realize what such education involves in educational principles and classroom practice.

A people who choose to make education an ally of democracy will pledge themselves to develop a courageous program for their schools. A person is educated for democracy to the degree that he is qualified to make his way intelligently in the social milieu that bears him along and to share co-operatively in the control of that milieu for the common good. It is heartening to trace the increasing enlistment of this educational principle in school policy during recent years. Many schoolmen have come to believe that life and learning are complementary phases of a single process in classroom and community alike. They assume that the personality of the child grows through in-

teraction with its social environment, and consequently that the resources of learning must be not only "graded" but also dynamic in community awareness. Take the language arts, for example. They are no longer regarded in progressive education circles as a major discipline in the mastery of a vocabulary, a syntax and a grammar. Rather, they are regarded as the vehicle of cultures, reflecting the interests, sentiments, ideas and ideals of particular peoples. An American youth becomes proficient in his native language in as far as he can use it understandingly in social intercourse and make it a medium of communication concerning the divers aspects of his people's way of life.

The broad program of education for democracy includes many interrelated subjects of inquiry. The outlines of several of them have been traced in recent publications of the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association.¹ These inquiries suggest the core subjects in any program of education that sets for itself the preservation and expansion of the democratic purpose in society.

The cultural composition of the American people suggests another aspect of the general subject of education for democracy. This theme also needs to be charted. If our youth grew up in a coherent culture their lot would be difficult enough in this era of technological change, social revolution, growing world-mindedness. But they are subject to the influences of peoples and cultures transplanted from every quarter of the civilized world. They must learn to practice understanding, co-operation and goodwill toward each other. That is, they must if American civilization is to come of age.

*Because this paper is highly significant to two reading constituencies which overlap only slightly, it is appearing in both *RELIGIOUS EDUCATION* and in the *Contemporary Jewish Record* (April and June issues, 1941).

**Executive Director, The Service Bureau for Intercultural Education, 300 Fourth Ave., New York City.

¹The latest publication is *Learning the Ways of Democracy: A Case Book in Civic Education* (1940).

This suggests the subject of intercultural education. At least three basic factors are involved in canvassing the subject: What is the significance of the presence of various ethnic forces in America for making of a rugged civilization? What "culture" problems are naturally involved in their impact upon each other, and in the continuing impact on some or all of them of new cultural influences from every part of the world? And in the light of these confused conditions, what particular emphases need to be included in a program of education for American citizenship? Owing to the limitations of the present article, the writer must content himself with an overview approach to these questions.

Ethnic Factors in American Society

The following quotation from President Roosevelt's address before the *Herald-Tribune* Forum, October 24, 1940, suggests the importance of ethnic forces in American society:

Foreign propagandists have a strange misconception of our national character. They believe that we Americans must be hybrid, mongrel, undynamic; and we are called so by the enemies of democracy because, they say, so many races have been fused together in our national life. They believe we have no common tradition. They believe we are disunited and defenseless because we argue with each other, because we engage in political campaigns, because we recognize the sacred right of the minority to disagree with the majority—and to express that disagreement even loudly. . . . It is the very mingling of races, dedicated to common ideals, which creates and recreates our vitality.

In every representative American meeting there will be men and women and children with names like Jackson and Lincoln and Isaacs and Schultz and Kovacs and Sartori and Jones and Smith. These Americans with varied backgrounds are all immigrants or the descendants of immigrants. All of them are inheritors of the same stalwart tradition of unusual enterprise, of adventurousness, of courage—courage to "pull up stakes and git moving," as they used to say.

That has been the great compelling force in our history. Our continent, our hemisphere, has been populated by people who wanted a life better than the life they had previously known. They were willing to undergo all conceivable hardships to achieve the better life. They were animated, just as we are animated today, by this compelling force. It is what makes us Americans.

The President may have overstated the degree of mastery we have of our national household; he does take account of the various peoples seeking to associate intimately in the making of a great civilization.

The population of this country is heterogeneous in quality and kind. Consider briefly the ethnic situation. Of the 130,000,000 people in America, 30,000,000 are only one generation removed from Europe, 14,000,000 were born abroad, and 13,000,000 are Negroes. There are one-third of a million native Indians, and an equal aggregation of Orientals and Mexicans. If the standard of heterogeneity for a county is regarded as 1,000 persons of a race other than white, or 1,000 persons born outside the United States, then two-thirds of the counties in this country are heterogeneous in kind. More than one-seventh of the rural farm population are foreign-born or of foreign and mixed native and foreign white parentage; more than two-fifths of the urban population follows a similar pattern; and for the country as a whole the proportion is one-third. Although the immigration law of 1924 drastically curtailed the influx of foreign-born peoples into this country, approximately 150,000 immigrant persons do enter the United States annually. In New York City, the most striking center of heterogeneity, there are 1,688,184 children under fifteen years of age, only 523,118 (less than one-third) of whom are the offspring of native-born white parents.

The peoples of European background represent a wide diversity of cultural interests. It is estimated that there are in this country 60,000,000 persons of British tradition; 15,000,000 Germans; 10,000,000 Irish; 9,000,000 Slavs; 5,000,000 Italians; 4,000,000 Scandinavians; 2,000,000 French; and a million each of Finns, Lithuanians and Greeks. Included also are about 5,000,000 Jews of diverse national origins. Even these classifications may be divided into sub-groups reflecting specific social traits of old-world nurture.

In fact, if the complete picture were described, it would be necessary to indicate, in addition to cases of foreign-group segregation, the widest ranges of processes of intergroup conflict, co-operation and assimilation in the American scene.

While it is true that the numerical strength of an ethnic group is not necessarily the measure of its significance to society, these figures are revealing. They suggest, on the one hand, the presence in this country of a wide variety of cultural differences and, on the other hand, the allegiance of these peoples to a common faith in the democratic way of life. Democracy involves, therefore, among other prerequisites, the discovery of ways and means by which these peoples, respecting their differences, may learn to unite in solving the commanding political, economic and social problems that baffle this country. Such an experiment in intergroup democracy is going on in a trial-and-error fashion. It represents one of the most daring human adventures operative on a continental scale in modern history. If the effort is to be directed more intelligently and humanely, then it behooves our educational leaders to sense the issues that are involved and to introduce in the public schools a program that fits youth to meet the particular need.

Walt Whitman's "Salut au Monde!" may appropriately be addressed to the peoples of the United States:

Each of us inevitable;

Each of us limitless—each of us with his or her right upon the earth;

Each of us allow'd the eternal purports of the earth;

Each of us here as divinely as any is here.

And yet educators must guard against wishful thinking. Louis Adamic brings us back to our common task when he reminds us that "the presence in the United States of this vast new-immigrant element is an unprecedented opportunity for creating on this continent an extraordinarily rich culture and civilization, at the same time that it immensely complicates

American social, economic, political, cultural and spiritual forces and problems; inherent in our present population are certain dangers . . . and lest these dangers increase and intensify, all of us—new and old-stock Americans—must begin to become intelligently, patriotically, actively, critically interested in this entire situation, now generally wrapped in darkness and shot through with fear and sentimentality."

"Culture" Problems in America

There are two current uses of the term "culture." One may say that a person has charm and culture. Or, one may speak of Jewish culture, Chinese culture, Italian culture, or some other culture. It is in the latter sense that the word is used here. By culture the writer refers to the intricate complex of man-made forces by means of which a particular people expresses itself. These forces include folkways, customs, family patterns, language, laws, crafts, religion, and so on. In this sense it may be said that various old-world cultures have been transplanted in this country through the settlement of immigrant groups. The act is repeated every time a new wave of foreign peoples gains admission to the United States. Its latest manifestation is to be witnessed in the presence of German, Italian, Polish, Dutch and other refugees from Nazi-fascist oppression.

There are at least three major determining factors in a people's culture. The *national* character of a people may take precedence. For instance, the British have been schooled so long in a particular political tradition that it has trademarked their form of government, their means of self-maintenance, and their manner of participation in world-wide affairs. Moreover, their pattern of national life reveals strong powers of coherence and integration. The *ethnic* traits may take priority in a particular culture. One may note the language forms of the Dutch, the household customs of the Scandinavians, the

²*New York Times Book Review*, December 29, 1940, page 2.

musical taste of the Chinese, or the colorful dress habits of certain of the Slavic groups, by way of example. A third criterion of culture is *religion*. Few, if any, human interests are taken as seriously by a people as their religious faith. This enlistment deals with the great imponderables in human life and destiny. And possibly no people in history have maintained a more consistent and normative record in this respect than have the Jews.

There are those who regard *race* as a determining manifestation of a culture. This is true of the state-philosophy governing the mind of the German people at present. However, "racism," rather than race, characterizes their Weltanschauung.⁸ They have been taught to believe the dogma that their ethnic group has been blessed by Providence with the powers of congenital superiority and that they therefore have a mandate to lord it over all other peoples who bear the alleged marks of congenital inferiority. This same viewpoint is not strange to many Americans, who uncritically identify underprivileged economic classes with those supposedly suffering from the blight of congenital inferiority. The concept "race" may be reserved to refer to the physiological factors only that lend a measure of individuality to a people. In this respect one may speak of the White race, the Negro race, or the Oriental race, and the presence of representatives of a few races here in America.

A Conflict of Cultures

Whether the main criteria of a culture are national, ethnic or religious traits, or a combination of these with racial manifestations, every immigrant group entering America is the bearer of a heritage that has unique value for its members. This heritage usually suggests a long and distinguished history of an old-world culture; it includes family mores, dress and food habits, folk dance and music, sectarian beliefs and ceremonials, lan-

guage tools and literature, and the like. Not only does the transplanted group bear a coveted culture, but every member of the group as such also reflects this particular culture. One is reminded of Ellsworth Faris' statement of a principle which is widely accepted in social science circles that "personality is the subjective aspect of [a] culture and [a] culture is the objective aspect of personality."⁹ In other words, man tends to be group-governed in his behavior, and a socialized group cherishes a selective *ethos* of self-expression. Wherever Germans, Swedes, Irish or Russians, for instance, settle in this country as groups or as individuals, there German, Swedish, Irish or Russian forms of historic culture are enlisted. How deeply these pattern of life may root and perpetuate themselves in any particular case depends upon various factors that cannot be considered at the moment.

It is equally significant that every immigrant people entering this country becomes immediately subject to an American pattern of life. They are faced with a representative form of government, a Bill of Rights, the Stars and Stripes, public schools, a selective language medium, a business economy, a monetary system, a technology, certain holidays and holy days, and so on. These are the prevailing characteristics of American civilization. They may still be too differentiated and diffuse to be called an American culture; they are, in any case, the components of "a way of life" that is American and that is highly regarded by the rank and file of the American people.

In the light of these facts, local conflicts of culture are inevitable wherever new Americans settle in the United States. It is the case of a group quite naturally habituated in certain old-world ways versus a community normally devoted to the American way. The conflict may be due to voluntary or involuntary protests of one or both parties. For in-

⁸Ruth Benedict, *Race: Science and Politics* Modern Age Books, 1940, pages 151-53.

⁹Ellsworth Faris, "The Concept of Social Attitude," *Journal of Applied Sociology*, 1925, pages 404-8.

stance, the points of difference may center around secondary social values—such as vocal accent, dress habits or musical taste—in which case misunderstandings are usually temporary and the process of assimilation of new and old Americans moves forward rather rapidly. The newcomers may entertain a tradition akin to the American way, or they may be predisposed so strongly to want to become bona fide Americans that they hasten the process of identification with the ways of their adopted country. When, however, primary values are the occasion of conflicting interests—such values as family mores, political loyalty, or religious faith—the situation tends to become rather disturbing for all parties involved. The immigrant group may insist on perpetuating its cherished values, while the old-stock group protests the un-American behavior of the newcomers and takes steps to make their own viewpoint the normative one.

The assimilative process is aggravated frequently by the aggressive conservatism of older Americans. They may resent the intrusion, as they regard it, of Jews, Italians, Negroes, or some other people, into their neighborhood, their hotels, their theaters, their churches, their schools and colleges. They may demand a "restricted" community or insist that out-group peoples should live in "the ward" or "across the tracks." A psychological ghetto is sustained by the pressure of public opinion of the dominant group. Thus Americans have encouraged the formation of numerous cultural "islands" in their cities. We are familiar with Chinatown, Harlem, Little Sicily, and the like. The astute observer is also familiar with the fact that such settlements tend to perpetuate the least desirable aspects of old-world cultures, that they resist Americanization, and that they pave the way for interethnic conflict of a defensive nature along the marginal areas between the islands.

The rapid development of the industrial system with the exploitation of cheap labor has accented this unfortunate cul-

ture trend in urban centers. In fact, the growth of an economic class system in this country is introducing another major determinant in the quality of American civilization. The sharecroppers, the Joads, unskilled labor, white-collar workers, entrepreneurs, business executives, capitalists—are not these groups all too often translations into permanent class differences of the accidental differences in status between those who came earlier to take advantage of the country's abounding opportunities and those who came too late? When the economic motif of a group reinforces other group differences, serious disintegrative conditions arise in the community and the issues in the conflict of cultures are sharpened.

Take the Jews' lot in Germany, for example. Adolf Hitler, sensing that the German people were riding a wave of economic and political insecurity, was able to infect with his passionate hatred of the Jew vast numbers of people who were groping for a recognizable cause of their distress, and thus promoted the vicious anti-Semitic attack. When the country found itself in desperate straits and inner disunion, it was easy to revive old prejudices and superstitions that tended to raise the self-respect of the suffering masses and at the same time to find a scapegoat for their failings. A parallel situation arises in this country whenever the price drops out of the cotton market in the South. There is constant economic rivalry between the lower economic class of southern Whites and Negroes. When the price of cotton falls, the inter-race conflict becomes more acute, and it is alleged by some who have studied the related phenomena that the incidence of lynchings rises.

Changing Forms of Interculture Conflict

One might have hoped that the drastic curtailment of immigration into this country during the past seventeen years would have reduced the grounds for interculture conflict. Unfortunately this is not the case. The conflicts between culture groups are taking new forms, fre-

quently more subtle and involved. There is, for instance, the entanglement of ethnic, racial and religious misunderstanding with various economic interests that drives peoples apart and arrests the socialization of community life.⁸ Besides, the firm devotion of many immigrants to old-world folkways in the face of the loyalty of their children born in America to this country's customs has paved the way for acute conflict in innumerable families. Louis Adamic, who probably knows conditions within these homes as well as anyone, speaks at length in *My America* of "... the profound tragedy of immigrant parents in relation to their American-born children."⁹

Not infrequently under these circumstances the children not only fail to acquire the best fruits of their parents' traditional culture but also are prevented from embracing the normal advantages of the American heritage, to face life with that inner security and self-confidence which are essential for success. Torn between conflicting desires and loyalties, they become social liabilities. For many, this inner struggle has been a hammering out of strong personalities; they have provided unusual talents and leadership in many walks of life. But for others, this inner conflict, added to the struggle for a worthwhile existence by American standards of material welfare, has been too much. "American-born children of foreigners are much more likely to commit crimes than native-born persons of native parentage, but the reason for this, strange as it may sound to the 100 per cent American, is *not* because they are children of immigrants, but because they are Americans and are no longer controlled by the traditions and cautions which keep their parents in the paths of

rectitude. In one important sense it may be said that *Americanization* is one of the chief causes of crime in the U. S."¹⁰

Another condition contributing to shifting forms of intercultural conflict has been the recent business depression. The Negroes were, as a rule, the first group to be retired from the workers' lists in mill and factory when times became hard. A decade of unemployment with its grievous social by-products has recast the social attitudes of a large number of Negro people. They are no longer docile and cheerful conformists to the white man's will; they have become race-conscious, protestant, even militant on behalf of their just rights as Americans.

What may be regarded as war psychology is still another dissentient force. It has become popular to be pro-British and anti-Italian or anti-German in the expression of patriotic sentiment. Most people uncritically transfer their pride or scorn for the war leaders in Europe to their kinsfolk in America. A person bearing a German name need not apply for work in many households in the East. The same holds true with reference to Italians and Germans in their approach to many large industries.¹¹ The management often makes no attempt to discriminate between those who are thoroughly American in their loyalties and those who are in sympathy with fascism or National Socialism.

We are approaching here and there in this country a state of intercultural attitudes that may be described as psychological civil war. Social hysteria, labor troubles, strikes, witch-hunts of aliens, race prejudice and religious intolerance—these usually accompany great national crises and are not lacking in America in the present hour. In 1939, Alvin Johnson, director of the New School for Social Research, estimated that there were approximately eight hundred groups in this country organized to suppress so-called foreigners.¹² It is doubtful if the situation

⁸For illustrations as to how this principle expresses itself, see B. Schrieke, *Alien Americans*, Viking, 1936, pages 91-4.

⁹*My America*, Harpers, 1938, page 248.

¹⁰Frederic M. Thrasher, "Are American Criminals Foreigners?", in *Our Racial and National Minorities*, by Francis J. Brown and Joseph S. Roucek, Prentice-Hall, 1937, page 698.

¹¹Louis Adamic, *My America*, page 249.

¹²*New York Post*, January 25, 1939.

has improved in the light of the rising tide of social censorship in America. Note the number of headlines appearing in the daily press which indicate local conflicts between cultures.

By way of recapitulation, it may be said that the present conflict of cultures in America takes a wide variety of forms. Determining factors in intergroup friction include national, ethnic, racial, religious and economic forces. In certain cases the contacts have eventuated in an accelerated assimilation of peoples into a homogeneous American folk. In many instances minority groups are discriminated against by old-stock Americans, accentuating cultural differences and social conflict. The fundamental problem posed by this situation may be stated as follows: How can old and new Americans accommodate themselves as persons and groups to each other to guarantee to all parties the largest measure of freedom of self-expression and yet at the same time insure the maximum of coherence, vigor and democratic maturity of the American people? It is the old problem of the one and the many pitched on a continental scale and set to the tempo of revolutionary social change, in which the need for rational intercultural planning is of paramount concern. Can the official slogan of the United States, *E Pluribus Unum*, remain a meaningful and dynamic objective for the American people?

II. CULTURAL DIVERSITY AND EDUCATION

Americans are so preoccupied with watching "the trees" of our civilization that they cannot see "the woods." They react to neighbors without sensing the social reality of the neighborhood or the broader demands of the community and the nation. Their characteristic attitude is provincial rather than worldminded. There is one exception to this, however: not infrequently, when men look at ethnic, racial and religious groups, their perspective shifts. They become so intent upon classifying and locating the status of such culture groups that they disregard the

fundamental significance of the individual persons who bear the cultures and who furnish them their distinctive quality. Many will assume, for instance, that they know the constituents of Jewishness or Germanism quite independently of any experience of friendly personal relations with representative Jews or Germans.

From the viewpoint of culture analysis, as the term "culture" is used in this article, the units of American civilization are the ethnic, racial, religious and economic groups to which the writer has made reference. But the units of these cultures are the personalities of men, women and children. These latter are the vital factors as well as the supreme values of a social group and of American society.

The Priority of Persons

Many immigrants distinguish themselves in coming to terms with the American way of life. The demand for serious readjustment of personal modes of living does not necessarily offer them an insuperable barrier. On the contrary, the very vigor of the challenge often serves as the needed stimulus to draw out of the newcomer his latent resources of personality and leadership. Consider, for instance, the persons of foreign birth listed in *Who's Who in America*. The Common Council for American Unity published this list recently with an editorial article by Will Irwin. It will surprise the reader to observe the length of the list and the names of many individuals who he had always assumed were born and bred in this country.

The achievement of superior personal adjustment to the changed conditions of life is not limited to those whose names become signal references for one reason or another. It is the record of innumerable immigrants whose lives are spent in modest roles, "unwept, unhonored and unsung." They man factories, mines and farms; they furnish the recruits for construction gangs and highway buildings; they grace the home and the family fireside. For every Riis, Schumann-Heink,

Lane, Bok or Einstein, there are hundreds of their former fellow-countrymen who have accommodated themselves to the exigencies of life in this country, who have become exemplary citizens, and who have enlisted their talents in the building of American civilization. Such individuals may be regarded as so-called normal persons. They illustrate how flexible personality is and how effectively persons can adjust themselves to the conditions of a new society when they are accorded a reasonable opportunity to find their way.

Unfortunately, this is not the complete story. Too many immigrants never quite achieve real ease in adapting themselves to the American way. Adversities of various kinds block them. The responsibility for these barriers rests more often upon the American people than upon the newcomer. His social role is made hard by the class lines, racial, ethnic, religious or economic, that have been drawn by old Americans. Unneighborly attitudes arrest the process of socialization that would otherwise operate somewhat naturally.

Nor is the problem simplified even for the American-born children of immigrants or for persons of the second or third generation of new Americans. Too frequently, the situation becomes more acute. What happens to the personalities of youth who are subjected repeatedly to the following conditions?

A child reflects his distress to his teacher when he reports: "My parents are Italian; I want to be an American!"

A Jewish girl seeks an office position and discovers that "only Gentiles need apply."

A Negro youth is refused admittance to a theater where *Green Pastures* is being played by a Negro cast.

An American-born boy who happens to have a German name has epithets of Hitlerism thrown at him by schoolmates.

Such illustrations might be multiplied almost indefinitely. The files of the Service Bureau for Intercultural Education are weighted with them.

Take the case of the child of Italian background who wants to be a regular American. His number is legion in school and community. He is in danger of becoming what the social scientist calls a "marginal"¹⁰ person. Circumstances are coercing him to live in terms of two cultures, which are not only different but to some degree antagonistic. One is dramatized in the behavior and wishes of the old-world-minded parents; the other is expressed in the socially approved folkways of playmates and community. Occasions of conflict may include dress, food, place of residence, language, mores, religion, music, and the like. In addition, the parents may seek to perpetuate an arbitrary authority over the child, while he longs for the social freedom accorded to most American children. The situation may be aggravated still further by a public opinion which insists that he remain "Italian." That is, a Jim-Crow psychology operates in the community "to keep the foreigner in his place."

The schoolman may disapprove of the attitudes of both parents and community, as does the child, but he feels that he is as helpless as the boy to do anything constructive about the problem. Under such circumstances the child tends to become a cultural hybrid, at home in neither the Italian nor the American group but forced to make his peace with both of them. "The variety of social structures to which a growing child can adapt himself in a relatively stable way is astonishingly great. It seems, however, extremely difficult to establish a new stable social ground after one has been broken down."¹¹ It is not difficult to sense the plaintive, tragic nature of the boy's request, "I want to be an American!"

A disproportionately large number of patients in mental hygiene clinics are

¹⁰Robert E. Park, "Human Migration and the Marginal Man," *American Journal of Sociology*, May 1928, pages 881-93; Milton M. Goldberg, "A Qualification of the Marginal Man Theory," *American Sociological Review*, Feb. 1941, pages 52-58.

¹¹Kurt Lewin, "Bringing Up the Child," *The Menorah Journal*, January-March, 1940, page 36.

either foreign-born persons, their American-born children, or members of culture-conscious minority groups who endure particularly severe social strictures. Diagnoses reveal that the root of the difficulty is not usually organic disorders but rather behavioristic problems. "Environmental stress" has become heavier than they can bear. They suffer excessive shyness, precociousness, a feeling of social isolation, hypersensitivity or an incorrigible disposition. It is reported that a common source of maladjustment among Jewish patients is that they are not "encouraged by the major environment to be a Jew nor allowed to be a non-Jew."¹³ This, too, is the Italian boy's problem.

The situation is on the whole more favorable in the instance of the European refugees who are seeking an asylum in America. They are receiving, for the present at least, a kindly and sympathetic reception from the great majority of our people. Those who are being helped to find an economic livelihood, thus acquiring a measure of social purpose and security, recover rapidly from the ills of persecution to which they have been subjected over a period of months or years. There are exceptions to this rule, however—in the case of children as well as adults—who need patient and understanding treatment.

In any case, all is not well with the personalities of members of minority groups. Interperson conflict is the obverse side of intercultural conflict. The tides of tension and ill-feeling rise during periods of business depression and war, bringing with them a toll of strained personality conditions. The phenomena of racial prejudice, religious intolerance and class discrimination are widespread. These accultural forces are invidious in their inroads upon persons, as destructive for the intolerant as for his victim. On the other hand, they feed upon gross igno-

rance, economic fears, social hysteria and the partisan propaganda of special interest groups. Men are taught to live by stereotyped ideas and myths—myths concerning race, religion, business cycles, war, social control. On the other hand, they bring bitter suffering upon those discriminated against, and they blight the mentality and character of those who yield to the practice of prejudice. "Anti-Semitism may be an injury to the Semite, but it is a disease for the anti-Semite." The former turns introspective, acquiring a defeatist role, or militantly opposes the dominant group, adding fuel to the fire of intergroup conflict; the latter, while retaining his feeling of superiority, tends to lose his power to respect the personalities of minority group members, to achieve ethical insights, and to preserve democratic rights and values.

The National Socialists have become particularly adept in the use of a "softening up" technique among the peoples of Europe. By exploiting false ideas of justice, truth and freedom, they arouse class suspicion, capitalize on economic controversy, short-circuit political action, and thus weaken the resistance of the unsuspecting to military conquest. The same psychology operates in America wherever there is agitation and discord in the field of race, religious and ethnic relations.

The history of our people during the past twenty-five years shows how easily, in a time of widespread suffering or of national emergency, the cause of trouble is identified with a particular group. During the World War, citizens of the enemy nations, and their suspected machinations, were held responsible for every inadequacy in the national program of military preparations. Negroes, when they flocked in large numbers to the industrial cities to take advantage of new opportunities of employment, were hated in the South for causing a rise in the cost of labor, and in the North for causing competition and holding down wages. When banks closed and mortgages were called in during the economic depression, Jews were

¹³John Slawson and Maude Moss, "Mental Illness among Jews," *Jewish Social Service Quarterly*, June 1936, page 344.

the scapegoats of popular wrath, as they have been before in similar circumstances. Today, Americans of German and Italian descent are suffering from the tendency of the thoughtless to seek the causes of their discomfort and the objects of their hatred close by where they can be personalized. The Italian boy wanted to *be* an American; we ought to *remain* American and permit him to *become* an American.

A Citizenship Frame of Reference

On February 20, the Seattle Selective Service Board No. 9 called up twenty-two men for military service. It is significant to note that these draftees represented eleven different national and racial groups, and yet they were committed to defend their common country, the United States. Such is not an unfamiliar situation in the communities that make up America. In a real sense we are Americans All, Immigrants All! Therefore one is led to ask: How can we adapt our concept of citizenship to a time which makes such very different demands on it than did that of Washington and Jefferson, and even that of Lincoln? How can we make sure that the mutual defense of human rights is now accepted by all of us as involving, as an integral part of life and liberty, the individual's personal integrity and his possession of a cultural heritage as well as those things American to which all give unqualified allegiance?

This question has received at least three different answers by as many types of Americans. There are those who assume that the traits of an exemplary American are definite and clear, that they are the exponents and defenders of the same, and that therefore immigrants will become good citizens as they accept the dictum of these keepers of the faith. Citizenship is transmitted by dual methods of indoctrination and imitation. Newcomers are urged to forget their old-world heritage, to welcome the superior opportunities afforded in America, and to embrace the ways of their adopted country.

Of course, such a viewpoint rests on

several false assumptions: it is impossible for immigrant people to forget their past; they cannot shift cultures as they would change a suit of clothes. "Personality is the subjective aspect of [a] culture." Whether our mind is on material things or on treasures of the spirit, every ingredient of our rich American civilization is the product of a process of cultivation; and the seeds cultivated among us continue to arrive on every boat. We cannot afford to throw any of them away, for no one can foretell what parts of any culture transplanted to American soil may not become a precious addition to the possessions of the whole people. Moreover, what right has any self-appointed group to determine what is or is not the civic role of a good American and to impose it arbitrarily upon others? One usually is justified in entertaining the suspicion that this type of group, when it assumes such a role of superiority, is moved by an ulterior motive that will in time become a dissident force in intercultural relations.

Israel Zangwill has dramatized another popular view of Americanization in his play, *The Melting Pot*. It is granted that the various immigrant peoples are the heirs of cultural equities, that they should preserve them, and that the approved method of preservation is to pool them freely in the interactions of everyday life. The outcome of such an assimilation process, it is assumed, is the blending of a superior race of men, a unique culture, and a peerless American civilization. But on second thought we know full well that cultural streams do not "melt" into each other so simply and disappear as independent entities. And even if the contents of the pot did "melt" into a new amalgam, America would be sacrificing a wealth of cultural differences at the expense of a leveled-down uniformity of folkways and social mores.

Margaret Mead reminds us that American culture is too leveled now: "The conflict between alien groups bringing in contrasting and only partly understood European traditions has neutralized the contributions of each. If art and literature

and a richer, more creative culture are to flourish in America, we must have more content—content based, as all new ideas have been based, upon the diverse experiments of older, more individualized cultures.”¹³

This viewpoint suggests the conception of citizenship technically described as “cultural pluralism.”¹⁴ The phrase reminds one of William James’s idea of “a pluralistic universe” and the empirical school of social thought that has grown up during the past half-century. The theory of cultural pluralism takes due account of the presence and potential value to this country of diverse ethnic, national and religious groups. “When we lose the right to be different, we lose the right to be free,” Chief Justice Hughes reminds us.

It is assumed that these cultures have an invaluable contribution to make to the creation of a major world civilization. The different cultures, in as far as they remain the living faiths, attitudes, tastes and ideas of distinct groups in our population, act on each other and, through cross-fertilization, create new, distinctly New-World, American culture traits. Only those who in a measure retain their individuality—whether as individuals or as heirs, with others, to the cultural traditions of a particular ethnic group—can produce new and superior modes of personal living, instruments of human expression and fine arts of mankind. Thus, there continue the many particular ethnic streams, and there emerges a commonwealth of American culture. Neither trend is expected to dominate or capitulate to the other. On the contrary, they are reciprocal forces serving to give balance to the American way of life—a way that is still youthful and prodigal as civilizations go, but one that promises, when mellowed and matured through the com-

ing decades, to reach a level of superiority that may justly be compared in creativity with the *E Pluribus Unum* of ancient Greece.

There is a good illustration of how this principle of Americanization works in the purpose that foreign-language newspapers have served in this country. Note the evolution of the weekly paper, *Der Grontwet*, which voiced the interests of Hollanders for three-quarters of a century.¹⁵ Originally, it furnished Dutch immigrants a familiar language medium by means of which they could satisfy their nostalgic regard for the land of their birth; they acquired a sympathetic introduction to social affairs in their adopted country; and they exchanged views on divers subjects of common interest and thus learned how to accommodate themselves to Americana. “Those early immigrants were no less loyal Americans because they read the Gettysburg Address in Dutch.”

In due time a more sophisticated generation of Holland-Americans began to regard the language of their forebears as foreign, many family folkways as strange or comical, and inherited religious controversies as somewhat unrealistic. They desired to become regular Americans. Their interest in *Der Grontwet* faded and, eventually, the editor ceased its publication. This newspaper had fulfilled its purpose, however, and had paved the way for a third stage in the cultural orientation of Holland-Americans. Recently, these people have rediscovered certain values of their old-world heritage and are taking means to revive them for the pleasure and profit of every American. By way of illustrating this trend, consider the nation-wide popularity of the Tulip Festival in Holland, Michigan, each spring. This event is a symbol, on the one hand, of the continuing significance of cultural differences to various peoples, and, on the other, of folk events that unify and strengthen the American people.

¹⁵Arnold Mulder, “Life and Death of a Newspaper,” *Common Ground*, Spring 1941, pages 102-05.

¹³Margaret Mead, *Growing Up in New Guinea* William Morrow, 1930, page 257.

¹⁴Francis J. Brown and Joseph S. Roucek, *Our Racial and National Minorities*, Prentice-Hall, 1937, chap. xxvii, “Education and Cultural Pluralism,” by E. George Payne. This viewpoint is sometimes called “cultural democracy.”

From this viewpoint, how are inter-culture conflicts to be resolved? In the case of Negro-white relations, the issue is not necessarily a choice between plans for the social segregation of the Negro and an open road to racial and cultural assimilation, as many well-meaning people would carry the argument. Rather, the choice lies between methods of social suppression of the Negro (which democracy forbids) and the maximum of free social intercourse to which both groups would normally give approval. In the latter instance, the democratic rights and privileges of each party would be honored, and there would be a reciprocal exchange of cultural services and values so that the common American way would be strengthened.

In the case of the Jewish-Catholic-Protestant problem, a similar approach would be entertained. No religious group should suffer civic discrimination to the advantage of any other, but each should remain free to preserve those tenets of the faith that have vital meaning for its adherents, while at the same time Jews and Christians would unite in loyalty to the spiritual principles that undergird western civilization. That is the charter of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. The cultural implications of these principles are far-reaching in the social reconstruction of community life in this country.

This conception of citizenship clarifies one important phase of "the American Dream," without which this nation loses direction and suffers lassitude. For the educator it affords a frame of reference on the basis of which he can define the role of the good citizen. He can envisage a system of human values upon which our form of democracy rests and by means of which free personalities grow up. The modern educator respects culture groups not—like an archaeologist or a museum curator—merely for what they may contribute to the common wealth, but—as one engaged in the social process of educating youth—for what they may become by

means of shared human experience. "Our national life is a colorful meadow of many grasses, herbs, and flowers, a living carpet composed of seeds from near and far that have taken root on common soil. Their roots intertwine. Together they reach up toward the rain and the sun."¹⁰

In the area of intercultural education, it means that the popular terms "minority groups" and "majority groups" require redefinition. The two phrases remain quite relative in meaning. Virtually any group that has majority status in the local community becomes a minority group in relation to some wider consensus of interest expressed by a larger circle of people. One must guard against the subtle assumption that the term "minority group" implies an inferior social role of its members, and that the term "majority group," by reason of its numerical strength, is necessarily superior in civic worth.

The criterion of value of any group, large or small, in a democracy is its capacity to contribute to the enrichment of the common way of life, both within the group and between contiguous groups. The social tolerance of diverse culture groups, therefore, is not enough. We do not want to be content merely to endure a diversity of groups; we want to recognize them for their intrinsic worth and their co-operative achievements. On the one hand, they afford media by means of which their members nurture the intimate aspects of personality development; and, on the other, they interact to lend variance and vigor to American civilization.

The Field of Intercultural Education

Suppose that the public schools of this country accepted responsibility for the intercultural education of American youth, what obligations by way of leadership, curriculum and educational techniques would be involved? As to the personal and democratic values that would accrue to school and community upon the adoption of such a program, providing that it

¹⁰Bruno Lasker, "What is Cultural Democracy?", *Intercultural Education News*, January 1941, page 7.

were carried forward intelligently, there is little doubt. James G. McDonald has made the observation: "If we were able to develop in this country a really adequate system of intercultural education, we should go far towards solving the problem of national unity." And John W. Studebaker writes: "I am impressed again with the importance and complexity of the problem with which the Service Bureau deals. I am also confirmed in my belief that the public schools of the nation should be everlastingly working at this problem."¹⁷ Here and there a local teacher is experimenting with intergroup projects.¹⁸ An occasional school has made the principle of intercultural democracy an integral factor in its program.¹⁹ But the basic purpose to which the writer has been addressing himself in this article remains a remote objective for the majority of public schoolmen.

The reasons for this situation are not difficult to understand. Most schoolmen are preoccupied with an educational program that has become increasingly involved in recent years and apparently leaves little leeway for the consideration of additional problems. There are some leaders who regard the intercultural field as a secondary or negligible concern in general education. The very freshness of the issue, put in classroom terms, suggests to them that it may not be in harmony with the trusted and tried policies of the public school system. As a matter of fact, when one considers the subject of intercultural education realistically, are not two observations clearly patent? One, that the American people require a civic faith adequate to enlist all the latent culture and intercultural values in this country; and, two, that the public school, as a special guardian of democracy, must nur-

ture the younger generation in this quality of citizenship?

Alert schoolmen may recognize this need but sense a feeling of futility in approaching the problem for the reason that they believe the American people are not prepared to support such a provocative program; or, they may fear for the outcomes if the program were adopted. There is always the chance that a clumsy introduction of the subject in the classroom may confirm or arouse unfavorable attitudes among children representing diverse cultural groups. Besides, some teachers and administrators in their own persons entertain fears or prejudices toward members of minority groups, believe implicitly in the doctrine of superior and inferior "races" and creeds, and therefore defend the status quo. That is, they question the soundness of the postulates upon which any program of intercultural education must rest.

One of the chief difficulties centers in teachers colleges, where teachers secure their professional education. Few of these institutions have as yet made an adequate place in their program for the critical orientation of teachers in this human scene that is America. It is true, courses in social psychology, even in anthropology and kindred subjects, are increasing in number; but the former are usually limited too closely to classroom problems, and the latter are often no more than perfunctory general introductions, giving the students neither the ability nor the incentive to explore the human reality of the communities where later they will work. And while every teachers college today makes some provision for the study of human relations from the standpoint of group leadership, the graduate is as yet rare who has been equipped with sound principles and methods of dealing with the intercultural maladjustments in the community in as far as they will be reflected in the classroom.

It is important that the basic issue in intercultural education be clearly articulated. If the principle of the priority of

¹⁷Letters in the Service Bureau's file.

¹⁸Jeanora D. Wingate, "Intercultural Education," *Journal of the National Education Association*, December 1940, page 269.

¹⁹Note the suggestion in *Learning the Ways of Democracy: A Case Book of Civic Education* Washington, D. C.: Educational Policies Commission, 1940.

persons in educational planning is honored in the school and the fact that personalities grow in democratic behavior through friendly interaction with each other across class and culture lines is granted, then the chief difficulty is the maintenance of socialized attitudes and values in teacher and pupil alike. Negatively speaking, the interperson problem is one of prejudice, discrimination or intolerance; positively conceived, it is one of the practice of respect and co-operation between person and person, group and group. What is a non-Jew's prejudice against a Jew, if not a biased attitude by means of which the non-Jew not only misrepresents the Jew but also miscarries social and ethical thought about Jews? The former imputes to the latter a subordinate or negative value in society. What is a white man's respect for a Negro, if not an understanding attitude in which the white person appreciates the intrinsic human worth of the Negro and therefore treats him as he himself would want to be treated? He assumes that the Negro is a normal human being of high value in his own right and to society. Since ethnic attitudes and values are usually weighted with feelings and convictions, the intercultural problem from the schoolman's viewpoint focuses in the education of the emotional life of persons.³⁰

It is equally important that the objectives of intercultural education be kept in view. Without question, the first outcome to be desired is a superior scale of personal values in school and democratic society; another, closely associated, is a recognition of the fact that individuals reflecting various cultures—however different in color, folkways, religious faith or economic class—are persons and should therefore be accorded all the deferences of personality in every relationship of life. The principle of cultural pluralism, as described above, suggests the basis of good citizenship in social education. It behooves the school to affect the

educational process by such ways and means that the members of the various culture groups in America may acquire an understanding of each other, a due appreciation of the intrinsic values of each other's cultural background, and a willingness to accept and co-operate with each other as persons (rather than as representatives of particular culture groups) in building a common American civilization.

It follows that there are at least three broad areas of intercultural education. In the first place, teachers require a scientific approach to the subjects of race, culture, minority group, dominant group, the democratic process, constituent ethnic, economic and religious elements in American civilization, and how they interact. They need to discriminate between fact and fiction with reference to the group differences in this country if they are going to help children acquire an intelligent approach to each other and to their family heritages.

Secondly, teachers must have a critical orientation in the field of social attitudes and values if they are to understand the relationships that children of different backgrounds assume toward each other. They need to be able to recognize the phenomena of prejudice or intolerance when they see them—what are their earmarks in personality, why they arise, and what treatment is ameliorative, if not corrective. This opens up the difficult subject of reconditioning children's attitudes that have become unsocial or anti-social. The well-intentioned teacher is as liable to accentuate prejudice as to relieve it when he proceeds with a treatment, unless he senses the soundness of his method and of ways and means of checking attitudinal change.

In the third place, teachers require an apprenticeship in the use of educational techniques whose specific purpose it is to inspire in children democratic roles toward each other. There are various ways of implementing intercultural education. They can be learned; and the creative teacher, who himself maintains friendly attitudes toward the children, can use

³⁰Daniel A. Prescott, *Emotion and the Educative Process*, American Council on Education, 1938.

them effectively in any and every course of study or social situation that arises in the public school. Intercultural education is not solely a theme for the social studies; it needs to be integrated into the language arts, into music and the dance, into domestic science courses, and, since social attitudes are being stimulated favorably or unfavorably in every aspect of school life, this interest needs to be nurtured in the activity phases of general education.

The teacher may resort to direct or indirect educational methods, preferably the latter. And if the latter, he may use the informative, dramatic, visual aid, assembly activity, community inquiry, field trip, or any one of other possible approaches to this subject. Until this professional qualification becomes the property of teachers and is enlisted as a normal phase of the day's services in classroom, assembly and playground, we are delinquent in educating youth for the responsibilities of American citizenship.²¹

²¹A similar responsibility rests upon leaders in adult education in home, church and community.

²²Write to the Service Bureau, 300 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y., for descriptive literature.

The Service Bureau for Intercultural Education

The Service Bureau for Intercultural Education has been experimenting over a period of years in this important field. It has accumulated considerable experience in the various related phases of the subject. Not a few educators have co-operated and are co-operating with the Bureau in an effort to deal with the social ills that separate culture groups, that regiment child against child, and that spread the un-American movements of one hundred percent Americanism, anti-Semitism, Negro segregation, and various discriminatory practices against minority peoples.

This is not the occasion to describe the techniques and reference materials that have been tried and tested in an effort to meet these ills. In due time they will be published and will supplement the teacher helps available in the Service Bureau library at the present time.²² Meanwhile, the Bureau is continuing its exploratory work and invites all who honor the American dream of *E Pluribus Unum* to share with it in helping such children as the Italian boy to fulfill his wish, "I want to be an American!"

RELIGION ON THE COLLEGE CAMPUS

ARTHUR L. FREDERICK*

INSTITUTIONS of higher learning have been severely criticized for lack of a vital religious program. Because of personal interest and financial investment of church members, the censure has fallen most heavily upon the denominational college. While such condemnation has become less pronounced and emanates mostly from conservative clergymen, with occas-

ional protests from vociferous laymen, it does not follow that the conditions have changed sufficiently to warrant the diminution of such disapproval. A cursory study will easily reveal that religious programs with students have not kept pace with other educational developments in American higher education. Nor are the generally accepted theories in the field of religious education usually applied to religious work on the campus.

*Professor of Religious Education, College of Puget Sound.

THE CAMPUS SCENE

Opportunity for religious development on the campus is provided by a multiplicity of organizations and institutions as well as through certain intangible, indefinable influences. These last, though not easily measured, may prove more important than any or all planned efforts.

With few exceptions, every campus has a Young Men's and a Young Woman's Christian Association which perform their tasks in one of three general ways. Usually each Association operates as a single, independent unit, carrying on its own work with its respective sex group. In other cases, the two organizations, while maintaining separate identities, coordinate their activities, promoting certain phases of their work cooperatively and others independently. A procedure finding favor in recent days merges the two Associations into one larger Christian Campus Federation which manages all the functions formerly conducted by both the Y.M.C.A. and the Y.W.C.A.

Regardless of the organizational relationships, the program on the one hand may simply be carrying out in a mechanical way a general pattern submitted to the local unit by the national body through its regional secretary, or on the other hand may be a well developed, democratically conceived program based on the needs of the students of the particular campus.

The college chapel, like the Christian Associations, is a time honored institution in higher education. Different sections of the country vary greatly in the importance they attach to the chapel program.

A study made a few years ago under the auspices of the Council of Church Boards of Education reveals the fact that less emphasis is placed on chapel programs in colleges on the Pacific coast than in those on the Atlantic seaboard. If the United States were divided into five longitudinal sections, as one moves westward from the Atlantic, each section would reveal less

emphasis on the chapel program.¹

Historically, the president of the institution has reserved to himself the management of the chapel program. He may, however, delegate its conduct to a faculty member or to a faculty committee serving under his direction or dictation. Increasingly, certain responsibilities are given to students. In a few institutions, complete control is in the hands of a committee of five to nine students appointed by the student body officers, and one or two faculty counselors elected by the faculty.

The chapel periods are used in an astonishing variety of ways. The traditional opening, with a hymn, Scripture, and prayer, may be followed by anything from a football-rally or entertainment by a magician to a highly educational or devotional address. Occasionally, we may find a carefully planned worship service which would meet the approval of the most critical. Where control is in student hands, there is usually considerable student participation in the conduct of the worship services. In such cases students preside, offer prayer, contribute musical selections, and not infrequently present the devotional message, should such be called for by the particular type of service.

In instances where faculty control is pronounced, the conducting of the chapel program is restricted almost entirely to adults, often with faculty members serving exclusively in regular rotation, or with faculty leadership occasionally supplemented by visiting ministers and other adult individuals from the community.

A Religious Emphasis Week is part of the religious program on many American college campuses. It may take the form of an emotional revival or evangelistic meeting, highly superficial in character; or it may be a powerful influence in vitalizing the religious life of students and faculty

¹Gould Wickey and Ruth A. Eckhart, "A National Survey of Courses in Bible and Religion in American Universities and Colleges," *Christian Education*, October, 1936, page 9 and following.

alike. Arrangements for the week are usually made and administered by the president or a faculty committee appointed by him. Occasionally such programs are planned and executed by students with limited faculty counsel. The week's schedule calls for a lengthened chapel period on either a voluntary or compulsory basis each morning of the week, usually conducted by an outside religious leader. Occasionally, the total responsibility is assumed by the president, who then both plans and conducts each morning's service. Where off-campus leadership is used, provision is often made for personal conference with students.

A peculiar function of the denominational college in the past has been to teach the Christian religion. Often this has been limited to conducting credit courses, a certain number of which are required for graduation. In more recent times, institutions supported by public funds are also giving credit for religious studies, under a variety of administrative conditions. Frequently the offerings are nothing but traditional studies in the Bible, designed to satisfy a conservative constituency. Increasingly, the denominational colleges, at least, are aiming to help students develop a basic theological foundation for their religion, and students are compelled to come to grips with the relation of science, religion, and the Bible; biology and the virgin birth, how to account for suffering in a world a good God made, and many other perplexing problems. Courses may be taught on marginal time by the president, or by a professor who has a vital interest in religion but whose special training has been in some other field, or they may be taught by men who are excellently qualified as students and teachers of religion, giving full time to this one major task.

Work among college women is receiving increased attention. The development of organizations such as Kappa Phi among the Methodists and Kappa Beta among the Disciples of Christ is significant.* It

is insisted in the constitutions of these organizations that they are not fraternities or sororities, and that they are open to all members of the respective denomination. Practically, the clubs may become very exclusive. In some colleges the membership consists of leaders of campus life, while in others it is made up of "refugees" who could not afford, or have been denied, membership in a social sorority or fraternity.

A complete picture must include a type of religious work found on the larger university campuses commonly called the Foundation. Several of the great denominations have developed a religious program for their students, either on the campus or adjacent to it. Representative of work done in this manner are the Roman Catholic Church, working through the Newman Clubs; the Jewish Synagogues, through the Hillel Club; the Presbyterian Church, through the Westminster Foundation; and the Methodist Church, through the Wesley Foundation. The usual type of Foundation includes a paid worker, either full-time or part-time, who in some instances is the minister of a church near the campus. Financial support for any individual unit on a given campus comes from one or all of the following sources: the denomination at large, the individual churches within the region where the Foundation is located, and the local church near the campus.

More important even than organized religion on the campus is that indirect and intangible spirit which is pronounced when present and seriously missed when absent, but which adroitly eludes definition. We might call it the Spirit of the Campus. Surely one of its elements is faculty influence, which may be manifested in a variety of ways. Faculty members' participation in civic and religious institutions of the community has telling effects upon the students. More important still is the "aside" remark in classroom or in personal conference. A faculty member may be critical or sympathetic, cynical or reverent, pious or genuine, religiously intelligent or misinformed, emotionally

*Townier, *Religion in Higher Education*, University of Chicago Press, 1931, page 263.

balanced or lacking in poise. Any or all of these qualities undoubtedly make their impress on students.

There is likewise an indelible mark which churches in the college community make upon the young people. These students who have been trained to apply critical judgment to all social institutions may witness churches cooperating in city-wide activities in a statesmanlike manner, indicating a serious endeavor to bring the Kingdom of God into their community; or they may observe churches using any known device to gain personal advantage over neighboring organizations. Such performances, no matter how subtle, speak louder than all the sermons preached from all the pulpits. Announcements of church programs and sermon subjects appearing in daily papers produce negative or positive effects. Local churches may invite students to attend their services of worship and their church school classes, causing them to feel like visiting guests for a day; or students may be taken into the very life of the institution and urged to engage with the membership of the church to build a strong, democratic, member-centered church program.

Clergymen conducting chapel programs bring a definite influence. A minister may deride science and reveal that he knows less about that subject than do the freshmen at the college. Such a leader does himself no credit, nor does he raise the student's respect for religion, by stating such inanities as "at least *my* ancestors were not monkeys." Ministers may appear before students unprepared, assuming a superior air; or they may come in genuine humility, but with a positive, carefully prepared, constructive message.

Here then is our rather muddled picture of the present college scene. Confusion is paramount, but the very fact that it is recognized is a healthy indication, and may be the beginning of growth. Our bewilderment may be caused by the lack of a clearly defined goal. This is our next task.

AIMS

Aims, goals, purposes, are the cry of education everywhere; yet in its religious program, the American college has not heeded the call. Just what are religious leaders desiring to accomplish on the campus? What should be the purpose of the religious program?

The aim of religious education on the campus is no different from that of religious education carried on by any other institution, nor is it clearly distinct from that of the rest of the educational work with the college student. Education, character education, religious education—all have one common aim: to help the individual function properly in his total environment. For practical purposes, this environment may be divided into three major areas, and without provision for any one of them education is quite incomplete. Hartshorne designates them as the biological area, the social area, and the cosmic area?²

All subject matter and all activity that are to continue in the curriculum or in the educational system at large must make distinct contributions in helping the student to function properly in one of these areas. Thus, religion cannot be separated from the rest of education, for our manner of functioning in relation to the cosmos will determine to a large extent how we act in relation to our fellow man. We may operate with some degree of perfection in our physical environment, but if our cosmic functioning is on a primitive basis, our total functioning will be decidedly unbalanced.

Every department of the college and all so-called extra-curricular activities have responsibilities in the task of helping students to function properly in all areas. There still remain, however, specific religious activities and specific goals which will need to be regarded seriously in every student's larger curriculum. We might call these "immediate aims" which will be

²Hugh Hartshorne, *Character in Human Relations*, Scribners, 1932, page 239 and following.

posited along the line in the working out of the ultimate objectives of proper functioning.

Most students who enter college, even though they are high school graduates, are merely children in their religious development. One immediate purpose of the Christian college is to bring the student's religious knowledge and religious development up to his chronological age level. Books could be written about the religious illiteracy of students entering college. Here we only call attention to it.

Equally important is the aim to equip graduates for effective churchmanship. Students should be helped to find a place of normal expression through the organized institution of religion, the Christian church.

One of the primary criticisms aimed at the denominational college is that it turns out graduates who have been alienated from the church. It may be true that many young people had no vital relation to their home church prior to their matriculation, yet the college must assume its heavy share of the blame for failure to help students who have passed from its gates to find their rightful place in the church.

Christian people justly expect more from college graduates than they do from other individuals, particularly when such young men and women come from a denominational school. If we expect the young graduate to take his rightful place in the church in the community of his choice, he must be equipped sufficiently to attain at least a moderate degree of success in church activities. If success is forthcoming from his efforts, there is little likelihood that he will ever withdraw. Surely his training in churchmanship during his college course, attained through the college curriculum and through the activities now incorrectly termed extra-curricular, as well as his experience in the local church of the college community, should so equip him that he will be more capable of assuming responsibility in building a church program than he would have been had he not gone to college.

These two responsibilities—bringing the level of the student's religious knowledge and development up to his chronological age, and training good churchmen—are important tasks which the college must increasingly accomplish if it would do its share in helping students to function properly in their total environment.

PRINCIPLES OF PROGRAM-BUILDING

Professional workers with students, faculty members who are endeavoring to give some help in developing a program of religion on the campus, and student religious leaders, all desperately feel the need for some guiding principles in their work. The following ten principles are set forth as a basis for the development of a program of religion, particularly for the small denominational college campus.

1. *The needs of the students on a specific campus must be the starting point in building a religious program.*

This principle is so generally accepted in educational circles that elaboration is scarcely necessary. It is quite true that there are needs common to young people in general, and there may be needs peculiar to the youth of a particular nation or even a section of a country. Certain it is, however, that the same specific need "does not necessarily arrive" on every campus at identically the same time.

One of the besetting sins of overhead organizations, as important as these organizations are, is to send down a *pattern* program from the national, to the state, to the local campus secretaries. Such programs may be easy to administer and are often demanded, but nothing could be more detrimental and deadening.

2. *The religious program on the campus should be indigenous to the student body. It must grow out of the grass-roots.*

It is just as impossible to meet student needs by a program superimposed by faculty or administration as it is by an overhead organization. Self-discovered needs, creatively worked into thoughtfully executed plans, release powers of motivation even though the results in terms of

the activities are not as carefully polished as those worked out by an experienced adult or professional leader would have been.

3. *Students and faculty advisers alike should share their experiences in building a religious program for the campus.*

There are three methods in which faculty and students may work together. In one procedure it is clearly understood that the faculty counselors shall speak only when called upon by students in the planning group. Such arrangement is detrimental to both faculty counselor and students. The former feels he is an intruder, and consequently the relationship is strained. The experience of the adult is called for only when serious mistakes are made.

Another procedure frequently found results when the opinion of the faculty members is taken as final. In few instances are digressions made from the adult judgment. The program thus becomes the product of the adviser. It may be good but students obtain no benefit, practice, or experience.

A third plan provides for sharing of experiences of both students and adviser. All grow in such sharing, and the results attained are usually better than those which either adviser or students alone could possibly have produced. Furthermore, this is the only procedure in which the democratic process in religious education can be maintained.

4. *All departments of the college are equally responsible for the religious program on the campus.*

No department in a Christian college can be exempt from teaching religion, in the broad sense. The professor of chemistry, for example, would perhaps wisely not say, "We are now studying how God, in His infinite wisdom, has caused hydrogen and oxygen to combine to create water." The whole study of the marvels in this field should be so sacred that the student will see God in the process without being told that He is there.

The writer's memory goes back to the two most religious courses he pursued in his entire undergraduate study. One of these was entitled *Evolution* and was offered in the department of Zoology. The other course was *Astronomy*. The professor of neither course ever dragged in religious phraseology, but the spirit of the teacher and the method of handling the course in each case produced a lasting religious effect upon students.

Every teacher, whether full professor or assistant instructor, is a teacher of religion; and by his fruits shall he be known.

The entire faculty should also have a share in the choice of the counselor or counselors for the specific religious program on the campus. Both the faculty as a whole and the counselors should feel that the latter are representing the entire faculty, rather than just the president or the dean.

5. *The religious program on the campus must be a unified program.*

New organizations are frequently born from new tasks. As a consequence, a multiplicity of approaches are made to students. This is often confusing and may be a demonstration of waste of energy or money, or both. If one organization faces the total task, there is less likelihood of programs overlapping, and also less possibility of overlooking certain positive elements of a well rounded program. Furthermore, where several organizations exist no one can be held wholly responsible.

The principle of unification is well tested and established in most other religious institutions. A Christian college, for the sake of its own efficiency and for the sake of the example it sets to other religious institutions, dare not lag behind. It must assume leadership in this field as well as in other realms.

6. *The religious program on the campus should relate students of any given denomination, as a group, to their respective churches in the college community.*

It is not enough merely to relate in-

dividual students to the particular church of their choice, either by an affiliate-membership or by some other individual method. Many churches in college communities have built Young People's Departments which consist of local young people engaged in occupational enterprises. College students, as individuals, are invited into this department. If the local occupational group is vigorous and active, college students frequently drop out, for the program can continue without them, and the interests of the group are not identical with campus interests. If the department is weak, and a goodly number of students participate, the local young people gradually drop out. This is not armchair guessing. The writer has conducted some experimentation and has seen others engaged in endeavoring to keep the occupational and the student groups together. The results seem eventually to work out the same way. Either *town* dominates and *gown* disappears, or *gown* dominates and *town* disappears. This is not because there is rivalry between the two groups; interests simply are different.

We have been concerned about the danger of widening the gap between the students and working young people. We have said that the college student too often feels that he is a special kind of human being and thus deserves special treatment. This should hardly be the conclusion. We place high school students in a department separate from junior high school pupils without causing them to feel like special human beings. We have formed a department for young people above high school age because they have needs unique to their station in life. It would seem reasonable to meet likewise the unique needs of students in college.

Educators are convinced that to live the abundant life at the station in life in which one finds himself, rather than to imitate what more mature folk do naturally, is the best training for tomorrow. Living wholesomely as a college student in the college environment is the best training

for the life of a future Christian business man. If we help the college student live rightly in his college environment during his college career, he will be helped far more than if we try to superimpose a workaday world environment on him while he is in college.

7. Religious leaders on the campus should capitalize on students' church affiliations and loyalties made prior to college entrance.

When students come to college they are unconscious of other students' church affiliations. Denominations play no part in the new life. This has certain advantages, but danger lies in the fact that not only are denominational prejudices eliminated, but frequently with them goes all Christian loyalty. Nobody knows that anybody "belongs." If Smith knows that Jones belongs to the same Lutheran Synod which he claims as his own, there is a fellow-Lutheran feeling. Religious leaders should capitalize on this fellow-denominational feeling and use it to its highest advantage.

To make this possible, some minimum skeleton organization for each denomination on the campus would be necessary. But the cry will come that we already have too much organization. This should be no objection, for it is merely a skeleton organization, and after all is just breaking down the one inclusive organization into smaller units. Furthermore, a national student secretary of a denomination might visit a campus. With no such skeleton denominational organization, there would be no group to arrange for the visit. With such skeleton organization, national student secretaries of various denominations might regularly make a contribution on a campus to student life as a whole, as well as to a particular denomination.

8. The student department must be an integral part of the church in the college community.

The church in the college community has a challenging and interesting task in

making the student department an integral part of its very soul and structure. The student department must never be conceived of as a "visiting department" by the church, nor should the members of the department be permitted to regard themselves in that light. Just as the college is the leader in its fields, so the church in the college community must be regarded by the student as an ideal pattern for a church.

In such a church, students and citizens of the community, all members of the church, will work together to build the best possible program for the constituency and membership. The program should not be built by the "regulars" who live in the community all through the year, and who naturally share a heavier responsibility over the longer period of time; but each year, students and townspeople should creatively share in building the new program for that year.

Such a church needs a minister who is a great preacher, a great pastor, and a good executive. Oftentimes a college community has not the necessary supporting church membership to provide such leadership and program. Since the best leadership of the communion is necessary for success, it will follow that the denomination's general or regional funds may need to be drawn upon; but this is indeed a small price if we are looking toward training graduates to be good churchmen.

9. *The religious program on a campus where a number of denominations are represented should be interdenominational.*

At the present time most religious work on the campus of our institutions of higher education is done either on a denominational basis through the Foundation movement, with each denomination carrying on a complete program of its own, or through an extra-denominational organization like the Y.M.C.A., Y.W.C.A., or the Student Volunteer Movement. The weakness in the former is that it becomes exclusive and carries on an independent program. The weakness in the latter is in

being extra-denominational.

In an inter-denominational program each denomination, through its skeleton organization, would elect and send representatives to a central planning group. This central council could view the total campus life and build one program so that every student would be touched. The organization would be similar to any inter-denominational body.

10. *The religious program on the campus should be related to the on-going cooperative, state-wide, inter-denominational program as represented in a state council of churches.*

The practical application of this principle would lead to the formation of a state-wide inter-college association. The governing body or executive committee would be made up of representatives from each campus in the state. It would represent the students in the total inter-denominational religious program of the state as the Student Department of the State Council of Churches.

Higher education in America, as represented in colleges and universities, has a contribution to make to the ecumenical movement. Ecumenicity is basically a state of mind, and thus must start with a philosophical concept. Students should be the church leaders of the new day. The highway to the ecumenical church must be built along the rough pathways of inter-denominationalism rather than on the smoother roads of extra-denominationalism around mountains of denominations.

A great task lies ahead. The finest place to begin in creating an ecumenical movement is among the most privileged educated young people. If we, as college teachers and administrators, can help bring to a higher level the religious knowledge of our youth and provide for their religion a theology which is solid, if we can cooperate with the churches in the college community to train good churchmen, we shall perhaps make our greatest contribution toward the building of a church in which "they shall all be one."

LABORATORIES OF DEMOCRACY

HEDLEY S. DIMOCK

This is the fourth Lecture of the Edward Corbin Jenkins Lectureship, given by Hedley S. Dimock, at George Williams College, Chicago, on February 28, 1941. The Lectureship was established in 1935 in honor of a pioneer in education, who served as president of George Williams College from 1926 until his retirement in 1935. The purpose of the Lectureship is to carry forward the pioneering spirit and educational philosophy of President Jenkins in recreation and informal education as a significant phase of the modern community. The preceding Lectures were given by Frederick P. Keppel, President of The Carnegie Corporation; Charles W. Gilkey, Dean of University of Chicago Chapel; and Eduard C. Lindeman, Professor of Social Philosophy of the New York School of Social Work. Dr. Dimock is Dean and Professor of Religious Education of George Williams College and a member of the Executive and Editorial Committees of the Religious Education Association. (Editor)

THE THESIS

Our thesis for the lecture tonight is a simple one to state. It ought also to be an easy one for this audience to agree with and to accept. But, to actualize the thesis, to embody it in our personal and institutional attitudes and habits—"ay, there's the rub."

Simply stated, the thesis is that the colleges, the schools, the churches, and the agencies of informal education should *become*, as rapidly as possible, laboratories of practice in the ways of democratic living. This is the contribution above all else that religion, education, and recreation can make to the cause of democracy in this fateful hour.

There is also a corollary to this thesis, as to many others. It is that the schools,

the colleges, the agencies of informal education and recreation, by giving themselves with whole-souled devotion to the cause of democracy, will, by so doing, achieve the *salvation of education itself* at a time when it is badly in need of being saved from confusion, aimlessness, and sterility.

In developing this thesis, with its corollary, I shall use this particular institution, George Williams College, as the chief center of reference and illustration, not because it is a "model" of democracy, either as a perfect example to be imitated or as a little "imitation of the real thing," but partly because the practice of democracy, as of charity, should begin at home. Another reason is that during the last decade we have conceived the College as a community of cooperative or democratic living, and in the process of embodying this concept in practice some "snags" have been encountered, some distinctive features have been developed, and some lessons that may have instructive value for others have been learned.

THE OCCASION AND THE HISTORICAL HOUR

The appropriateness of this thesis to the occasion and to the historical hour is easy of justification. The Edward Corbin Jenkins Lectureship was inaugurated to carry forward interests and purposes perceived and cherished by former President Jenkins. It was Mr. Jenkins who gave the initial impetus to the idea of conceiving the College as a community of cooperative living.

No less fitting is our thesis viewed from the standpoint of the current social scene. As leaders in agencies of formal and informal education we earnestly want to know what is our major responsibility to the cause of democracy and how

it can be fulfilled. It would be so easy to go off on a tangent, to do the "popular" thing, to join the "procession" wherever it may be going, to run along the groove of the prevailing pattern of thought or emotion. But education should not "marry the mind and mood of its time"; it has a creative function to perform, and great would be the tragedy if it were to abdicate that function in favor of the "fleshpots" of a superficial or sentimental patriotism.

THE CURRENT NEEDS OF DEMOCRACY

What does the cause of democracy most urgently need to safeguard its future in America? If we could correctly answer this question, we would be in position to discern the role that education should undertake. Much as I am tempted to evade so hazardous a job, our thesis demands that we attempt some appraisal of what constitutes the need of the hour of democracy in America. Happily for this purpose, the march of world events during the last five years has stimulated us to analyze more carefully the status and needs of our democracy.

Two things above all else are required if the American democracy is to meet the test of the present and of future decades. First, democracy must be understood and desired as an object of devotion. Secondly, it must be practiced or experienced in the gamut of human activities and relationships. It must be supported by persons whose attitudes and habits are indigenous to, and consonant with, the democratic, rather than either the fascist or the individualistic, way of life.

In selecting these two needs as the most imperative for a sure defense of democracy, we are not unmindful that military resources may in emergency be needed to permit the processes of democracy to function. But the function of such forces at the best is purely protective or preventive; they can add no more to the quality or quantity of democratic life than can a fire department achieve the beautification of a city. The fire department may protect buildings from burning, but to achieve

the city beautiful is a task that calls for architects, planners, engineers, artists, and builders. Let us look briefly at each of these two needs of democracy.

1. *If democracy is to be saved, it must be understood and desired as a worthy object of high-souled devotion.*

The use of the word "democracy" has undoubtedly reached an all-time high during the last five years. But it has had almost as many different meanings as there have been people using it. It has become a very convenient, even though emotional, symbol for almost any meaning that anyone, for any purpose, wanted to attach to it. It has become a magic formula for getting emotional consent without either intellectual understanding or agreement. Mark May has rightly pointed out that, "given freedom of private definition, democracy can be accepted and enthusiastically supported by conservatives, radicals, capitalists, Marxists, Fascists, Communists, and Republicans. We have at least achieved a democratic definition of democracy."¹ Under such conditions democracy may suffer from an overdose of popularity that is showered upon the word.

How can there be intelligent devotion to a cause or ideal so inadequately understood? You answer that there can be, and is, devotion for democracy on a wide scale. True, but much of this devotion is turned against that which is not democracy more than toward democracy itself. "We know what we hate better than we know what we love." It is easier to hate or to fear communism or fascism or Hitlerism, all of which can be effectively personalized, than it is to love democracy, which remains for many but a vague abstraction. Ardor for the cause of democracy results, then, not because "we love democracy more, but that we like fascism less."

The threat to democracy in Europe has greatly enhanced the emotional value of democracy without necessarily increasing

¹May, Mark A., "The Education of a democrat," *The Educational Record*, July, 1940.

our understanding of it. The stock of democracy has gone up in America in direct ratio to its slump in Europe. We see here the working of a very simple psychological principle, almost as axiomatic as the adage "you never miss the water till the well runs dry." When we think an object or value is threatened or imperiled, even though it has been taken for granted, perhaps even unnoticed and unused, it becomes for the moment very precious and must be protected at any cost. Shakespeare expresses a principle akin to this when he says:

"for it so falls out
That what we have we prize not to the
worth
Whiles we enjoy it, but being lack'd
and lost,
Why, then we rack the value, then we
find
The virtue that possession would not
show us
Whiles it was ours."

We need no longer be content with partial or confused interpretations of the meaning of democracy. There has been serious searching and probing for the deeper and basic meaning of the democratic concept and we are beginning to see that it embraces much more than most of us had realized. The democratic ideal, when analyzed, includes at least three elements or principles:

First, is the estimate of worth placed on persons. Persons are considered to be of supreme importance, the highest of all values. This means that persons should not be used as means to ends but should always be treated as ends in themselves. From this principle flows a second one, namely, that all persons should participate in social life, in carrying responsibilities, and in the control of affairs that affect them. And from this principle flows a third—all available resources in goods, intelligence, and institutions should be oriented and devoted to the development of all the persons in society. The needs and the development of persons, each of whom is unique, constitute the first claim

upon all of the institutions and resources of society.

Thus conceived, the democratic concept includes three indispensable elements: (1) an *ideal* that stresses the unique worth and supreme importance of every person; (2) a *method* or process of social living in which all share in the obligations as well as the benefits of associative life, a process in which intelligence is the method employed in seeking to act so that the greatest good for the greatest number may result; (3) a *social organization* that is designed to yield the largest values, economic, intellectual, and spiritual, for all members of society.³ The concept of democracy thus understood as implying an ideal, a method, and a form of social organization carries with it far-flung implications.

2. *If democracy is to be safe, it must be practiced or experienced in the gamut of human activities and relationships.*

The cause of democracy, like other good causes, has greatly suffered because of our misplaced confidence in the magic power of words. We have naively assumed that in transmitting the verbiage of democracy we were also guaranteeing its fruits, as though "words" if sown as seeds would blossom into deeds. Imagine an athletic coach depending upon words to produce the skills needed for football, basketball, or swimming! Yet that analogy fits our situation all too well.

No, we cannot longer depend upon training in the verbalisms of democracy to yield the realities of democracy. The ways of democracy must be lived, must be experienced, to be learned. Democracy cannot be inherited; it cannot be transmitted. It "cannot be given to a people any more than liberty, or justice, or happiness can be given to a society."⁴ It can be achieved, be created, be developed only as the product of the experience of everyday life. "Democracy," says John Dewey, "has to be enacted anew in every genera-

³See Tead, Ordway, *The Case for Democracy*.
⁴McSwain, E. T., in *Teachers for Democracy*, page 112.

tion, in every year and day, in the living relation of person to person in all social forms and institutions."⁴ Or, in the words of Goethe's Faust,

"He only gains and keeps his life and freedom,

Who daily strives to conquer them anew."

Where, then, are our children, our youth, and our adults to learn the difficult ways of the democratic life? At present the opportunities are meager. So meager are they that they are almost non-existent. The relation of most parents to their children is paternalistic; schools and colleges are authoritarian; and in business and industry most men and women work under the direction of others all day. Under such conditions how can individuals develop the attitudes and habits that are imperative if democracy is to endure?

The democratic way of life must be extended beyond the political realm into the economic, business, social, and religious realms if the cause of democracy is to be advanced. We must have more, much more democracy, or we'll probably have less, much less. Democracy cannot be "cabin'd, cribb'd, confined" in one sector of life—the political; it must permeate all the relationships of life or it has but little chance to command the respect and the loyalties of an intelligent citizenship. A little democracy, like a little learning, may be a dangerous thing unless we are ready to see its contagiousness spread from more to more.

What chance or likelihood is there that we shall achieve democracy in these wider relationships of life if we do not train persons in the skills of democracy in the areas of life that are under the control of agencies of education and religion? If we cannot practice the ways of democracy in education and religion, how can we expect them to be applied in business, industry, politics, and national affairs?

⁴Dewey, John, in "Education and Social Change," *Social Frontier*, May, 1937, page 238.

THE COLLEGE COMMUNITY—A LABORATORY OF DEMOCRACY

We come, then, to our description of George Williams College as a laboratory of democratic living. In approaching this task one craves the imagination and the talent of the artist or poet, so that features common and details dull might be portrayed with vivid color or expressed in lively meter. I am sure that from the raw materials there might be penned a stirring saga entitled "a decade of democracy in action."

We have already referred briefly to the origin of the concept of the College as a community of cooperative living. There were two basic ideas behind this conception. First, the central objective of the College, instead of being subject-matter achievement, was conceived to be the development of persons who would be effective in personal and social living. Secondly, it was recognized that the classroom and other aspects of the formal curriculum played a decidedly limited role in the equipment of persons for effective personal and social living. Associations, experiences, and forces outside of the classroom were seen to be much more influential in shaping attitudes and habits, in modifying personality and character than experiences related to the formal curriculum. The attitudes, values, and habits of students were being gradually but decisively modified by life in the dormitory, in fraternity and other social groups, in meeting the demands of a job, in adjusting to the complex life of an urban community, in planning for and using leisure, in forming friendships with members of the same and of the other sex, and in adjusting and maturing religious ideas and conduct. In the face of these observations, it seemed wise to consider the curriculum as coextensive potentially with the total range of experiences, activities, and relationships that composed the life of students.

In consequence of this conception of the curriculum as coextensive with life, many

creative efforts were set loose designed to break down the wall between curriculum and extra-curriculum, between formal education and the rest of life. Some of the efforts were in the direction of boring from "within" the walls of the classroom or of tunnelling under them by focusing attention more and more on these attitude-making experiences of daily life. Some illustrations of this approach to a functioning education will be described in a few minutes. Another very effective line of creative effort sought more directly to lift the various experiences of students to the level where their outcomes would be beneficial and therefore educational.

Our quest for the achievement of a community of cooperative living is best symbolized by the George Williams College Association. This is one of those rare things that fully merits the term "unique." As far as we know, it is "something new under the sun" in faculty-student cooperation and in college organization. In a sense, I suppose, it is compromise between the early university in Europe and the typical American college of today. You will recall that some of the early universities in Europe were formed and operated by students. The students set the curriculum, hired the faculty, "fired" the faculty, and ran "the whole show." The situation in colleges and universities today is almost entirely reversed. The administration and the faculty control the important phases of the college. Under the banner of student government or self-government, a few of the less important activities may be handed over to the students to manage—usually with adequate administrative control in case anything really important arises within the zone of "student government."

At George Williams College this traditional pattern of student organization, after some experience with it, was deliberately abandoned. The concept of education functioning through a community of cooperative living demanded a structure capable of embodying the new ideal. The uniqueness of the College Association is

to be found in three essential features.

First, membership and participation in the Association is open to students, faculty, and persons who work in office, dormitory, cafeteria, or maintenance positions. Potentially all persons in the College community are members of the College Association; actually all of them are at least represented.

Second, the College Association is either directly responsible for, or definitely related to, all of the functions of the College community—the maintenance of health; the provision for leisure; life in the College "home" or dormitory; the improvement of the curriculum; the program of informal education; provision for work and economic support; and the promotion of the "good life."

Third, the management of these basic human functions common to any community is a shared or cooperative responsibility. Instead of student government or faculty government, there is cooperative, or democratic, government. On most committees, for example (and there is of necessity a veritable "epidemic" of committees), there are both student and faculty members, with students as chairmen and faculty members usually, if not always, in the minority. Can you doubt that under these conditions a stirring epic might be written of our pioneer adventures in democratic living?

With this partial view of our conception of the College as a community of higher living and of the structure through which this ideal is expressed, let us examine more closely the "laboratory" to see if it is producing the essentials of democracy.

How does the College as a community embody the democratic ideal of the dignity and worth of persons? How does it facilitate practice in associate living where all share in the responsibilities as well as the privileges of corporate life? How does its form of social organization seek to utilize all available resources for the achievement of the good life for all? In looking at the College community from

the standpoint of each of these three phases of the democratic concept, we shall observe shortcomings, failures, and difficulties as well as achievements in the effort to embody democratic principles in practice.

I. *The democratic ideal stresses the supreme worth of persons*, of all persons, regardless of age or sex or race or occupation or religion, *as the highest of all values*.

Persons are to be considered as more important than anything else in the community. Surely, you say, it can be taken for granted that persons are of central concern in a college or any educational institution! It is only in business and industry that persons are subordinated to profits or other secondary things! So we might like to believe. Regrettably, we cannot. Educational institutions may be more interested in balanced budgets than in balanced personalities; more devoted to securing order and conformity from children or youth than to the release of inventive and creative capacities; more concerned in perpetuating a curriculum of subjects or a program of activities than in helping persons to live happily and significantly in the contemporary world. In these and other ways are persons subordinated to non-personal ends, and such subordination justified by neatly spun "alibis" that are most convincing—to those who advance them. What greater bulwark of authority, which is a form of autocracy, can be imagined than the habits of some classroom teachers? What set of habits can resist change more stubbornly or successfully than the deeply channelled habits of an instructor, unless it be the more firmly rooted set of collective teaching habits that we call the curriculum? We are reminded here of the old, but still effective, illustration of the persistency of habit used by William James. Even the word "habit," he points out, is hard to get rid of; take away the "h" and you still have "a bit"; remove the "a" and you still have a "bit"; take away the "b" and you still have "it."

But despite this seeming note of pessi-

mism, which represents a sincere and genuine confession of some of the difficulties in embodying the democratic ideal in education, there is a wealth of testimony on the side of success. I shall resist here the temptation to describe the systematic program of the faculty in trying to understand each student as a unique personality and to facilitate most fully his growth, in health, in vocational equipment, in academic achievement, and in personal, social, and religious development. Rather, let me give a few "snapshots" illustrative of how this spirit of concern for persons—all persons—permeates the life of the College and is enshrined at its heart.

1. One severe test of a democratic society is the attitude taken toward members of minority groups. A few weeks ago the members of a basketball team stalked out of a restaurant as a group because one member of the team was refused service. A few years ago a College dance was in progress in a neighborhood hotel. The manager approached the committee in charge of the dance and told them that the Negro students could not remain. To which the committee replied, "They stay or we all go." They all stayed (the bill had not been paid).

2. Another severe test of a democratic society is the extent to which there is a hierarchy of exclusive social groupings. In a college the fraternity system, with its practice of exclusiveness, is usually a stronghold of anti-democratic behavior. From the standpoint of need, the persons most likely to be invited into the privileges of fraternity life need it the least; those who most need the social support of intimate group life are least likely to get the "bids." At George Williams College this problem has been courageously tackled by the Interfraternity Council, which is endeavoring to work out a plan whereby every student who would like to be in a fraternity may have that opportunity. Here is a genuine democracy in the making—groups exist for persons rather than persons for groups.

3. In a democratic society every person

will have a sense of worth and dignity, a sense of being important to the community, achieved through contributing in some worthy way to the life of the group or community. The opportunities for such participation in the College community life are many and varied, so that the distinctive ability or talent of each person may find some constructive expression. But this is not left to chance. Committees systematically scrutinize the student roster so that no person will be overlooked. For example, when committees are being formed, consideration is given not only to what students can do the various jobs, but also to what the jobs will do for the students. The needs and growth of persons are central in a democratic community.

4. A final illustration of the centrality of persons in the College community is to be found in the Orientation Program for new students. All of us recognize how important for students are the first few weeks in college, from the standpoint of their sensing the spirit and larger purposes of the college and of developing a sense of at-homeness in the college environment. In a college like this, with about half of its students new each year, it is no easy task to help each student achieve this orientation and emotional at-homeness in the college community. Some of my contemporaries or near contemporaries will doubtless recall methods used in our day to "initiate" new students into their college experience. Their effects, if not their deliberate purpose, were frequently to make the new or "green" student feel more strange, more "green," more insignificant, more inadequate, more unadjusted, rather than to help him feel that he was genuinely wanted and really belonged in the new environment.

It is a far, far cry from those days and methods to the orientation program that operates at George Williams College. We can even afford to brag a bit, almost brazenly, I think, about this expression of democracy in action. In addition to the usual activities that enter into the orientation program of colleges and universities gen-

erally, the orientation program at George Williams College includes a number of features designed to reach and influence the basic personal, social, emotional, and spiritual aspects of the student's experience. In order to further these purposes, we go to College Camp on Lake Geneva for two days of the orientation program. Nearly fifty per cent of our returning students carry responsibility for planning and carrying out different phases of the orientation program and participate in the Lake Geneva experiences. . . . The sequel to the orientation program is the annual four-day retreat at Geneva in May, for graduating students and the faculty. . . . Were persons not conceived as of primary importance such events as these would never take place. "Persons first" is the watchword of democracy.

II. *The democratic ideal implies a method or way of associative living in which all share in the responsibilities as well as the benefits of community life.*

There are two indispensable requirements for effective democratic behavior: (1) social sensibility and responsibility, willingness to subordinate individual and group interests to the welfare of the larger group or community; (2) intelligence in solving problems, making decisions, and carrying responsibilities that arise in the quest of the good life. The best of social ideals and motives may be paralyzed or turned into destructive forces if guided by ignorance, prejudice, propaganda, or other forms of mental distortion.

The obstacles to straight thinking, to the intelligent pursuit of social ideals, are legion. Christian, the hero of Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, had a simple task in reaching the Celestial City compared with the task of those who seek to reach intelligent decisions in matters of social issues and relationships—in the pursuit of intelligent ways of thinking and acting as we are confronted by the deep mire of the Slough of our own intellectual inertia and laziness; the straight and narrow path up the steep Hill of laborious fact-finding and critical appraisal; the Valley of established

habits and the still more awful Valley of deeply rooted prejudices; the worldly allurements of the Vanity Fair of popular opinion and convention; the desperate struggle with Giant Despair of alibi, excuse, and rationalization, and, finally, the bridgeless River of propaganda, which threatens to engulf us in its incessant flow.

If these obstacles can be overcome, straight thinking in a twisted world is possible.

The College community or the collective life of any other educational agency provides an admirable laboratory for practice in these essential habits of democracy. Most of the elements of the normal and complex community are present, but in relatively simplified and manageable form. It offers a chance to experiment with democracy under conditions that promise some chance of success. Here, as we have seen, are the major functions of government, home, medical supervision and care, employment, formal education, recreation, and of religion as a function pervasive of all the others. Here may be found different racial, economic, national, and religious groups. The interrelations of these persons of different backgrounds are direct and personal. In such a setting, it is possible for all to visualize the wholeness of community life and to recognize emotionally as well as intellectually that social responsibility should accompany social benefits.

Three or four illustrations may be suggestive of the possibilities of this phase of democracy in action.

1. The sense of community responsibility and the attitudes and habits consonant with democracy are engendered through the activities of the College Association. The various functions in the community already referred to are managed by a cabinet and a set of committees that elicit the acceptance of responsibility by the vast majority of the members of the college community. Parasites, persons who believe their responsibility is fulfilled by the payment of fees, by voting once a year, and by accepting the services pro-

vided by the College Association, are few. Yet, in the normal community this pattern of delegated responsibility is prevalent. How many people feel that they have performed their function as citizens if they vote in all the elections, probably protesting that the choice is between Tweedledee and Tweedledum; if they pay their taxes, probably grouching about the increased taxation; and if they contribute to some of the more popular "charities." In our College community, electing officers and "paying taxes" are considered but meager beginning points in community responsibility.

The management of the athletic program alone, to take but one of the several community functions, is a large enterprise. Intercollegiate sports and a highly diversified program of intramural recreation are planned, conducted, and appraised by a committee the majority of which are students. (We have led the University of Chicago by nearly a decade in abolishing intercollegiate football.) The intercollegiate sports we do conduct are, with one exception, coached by students, and even in this one instance the coach stimulates the squad to analyze their objectives and to appraise their performance rather than acts as a person who is paid a high salary to tell the players what to do. I submit that if you can grant the members of an athletic team the luxury of making their own plans, choices, and decisions, democracy is not just a fantastic dream!

2. A basic test of a democratic community is to be found in the treatment of minority groups. Are minority groups discriminated against? are they merely tolerated? or are they understood, appreciated, and valued because of their capacity to enrich the common life? In a democracy differences in cultural groups are considered a source of innovation and of cultural enrichment and are welcomed and cultivated rather than eliminated. Though this is one of the hardest tests of democracy, genuine progress toward its achievement, at least, may be found in the free participation of members of mi-

nority groups in the life of the College.

3. The basic training in the skills of democracy must take place in the small intimate, interest, social, and functional group. The findings of research support the theory of the sociologist that it is these intimate, congenial groups that are most influential in shaping the values and the attitudes of their members. If the values that are nurtured and supported in these groups are the values of the democratic way of life, a powerful ally in the quest of a democratic victory has been gained. If the interests and values of these groups are centered in self, instead of in the larger community good, the scales are weighted heavily against the possibility of democratic attitudes and habits emerging in the group participants. If we were to tell the story of these smaller groups, of which there are many in this College, it would present an almost unbroken record of behavior in which groups have sought to further the common good rather than to exploit the resources of the College community for their own ends. And this, I submit, is a high test of the cooperative spirit. It does not just happen, of course; without the community spirit that is sensed upon entering the College, without the wider machinery of the College Association through which smaller groups may constantly be given a community focus and perspective, our smaller social or functional groups might be grave threats to the democratic way of life, as are the special groups that act as "pressure" groups or "blocs" in our normal community and national life.

III. The democratic ideal implies a social organization in which all of the available resources are devoted to the achievement of the good life for all.

In the larger community this means the equalization of opportunities for all, for socially useful work and economic security, for health and physical vitality, for the joy of human companionship, for constructive play and recreation, for the sense of belonging to a worthy social group.

Certainly for the students, at least, the

College meets this criterion of a democratic community. All of its resources are organized and devoted to the provision of these essentials of the good life for all, without inequalities or discrimination. (Even expression in the arts, long reserved for the privileged few, has been thoroughly democratized both in content and in availability.)

Perhaps this is the place for one story—a fitting final one, I think—of how one set of important resources became incorporated in the organized structure of the College community. (It is a very familiar story to my colleagues but it illustrates so beautifully so many phases of the College community as a laboratory for democracy that I know they would not want their familiarity with it to prevent your hearing about it.) It is a story that reveals the interrelated roles of the classroom and teacher, of the College Association, and of the College administration in merging education and life in the community of co-operative living.

Several years ago a student suffered a leg injury that necessitated extended medical treatment and convalescence. The health services of the College at this time made no provision for cases requiring such extended medical treatment and hospitalization. Nor did the student possess financial resources or insurance protection for such an emergency. Just at this time a class on contemporary social problems was in search of some live social problems that they might tackle for their educational fodder. It did not have far to look. The class attacked, as a significant problem worthy of their study, the problem of medical care in the College itself.* The medical records of the students at the College for several years were analyzed, to ascertain the number of cases requiring extensive medical care, surgery, or hospitalization. Descriptions of the medical service plans of other colleges were assembled and studied. Representatives from

*For a more complete description of this project, see "A Community of Learning," by Charles E. Hendry, *Progressive Education*, Jan., 1939.

the American Medical Association, the Rosenwald Fund, the President's Committee on the Cost of Medical Care, advocates of group medicine, and other resource persons were invited to the class or were interviewed by committees from the class. By the end of the Quarter the class had studied the problem sufficiently to make two recommendations to the College Association and to the president of the College. (1) That a standing committee on health be created (no such committee then existed) and (2) that some suitable plan of low cost, cooperative medical care and hospitalization be established. It required another year's work before the plan materialized. While the Health Committee gave careful attention to the medical and the financial aspects of various plans, a campaign of education in the College community was also carried out. Finally, with the cooperation of an insurance company and the professional staff of a neighboring hospital, an excellent program of medical services and hospitalization was inaugurated for the students. Since then several features of the plan have been made available to wives of students and to employees of the College. Remember, all this started with an accident and before the recent wave of interest in group medical care! Of such stuff is built the kingdom of vital education.

THE REGENERATION OF EDUCATION

We return, finally, to our original thesis. Democracy in America needs nothing in this critical hour so much as to be really understood, genuinely desired, and actually practiced on an expanding scale. Agencies of education, of recreation, and of religion, because of their nature, their purpose, and their resources, are confronted with the possibility of becoming laboratories in which the meaning and the skills of democracy may be learned through experience. If they will respond to this opportunity and accept this as their central responsibility, not only will the cause of democracy be tremendously advanced but the badly needed regeneration

of education itself will be accomplished inevitably, though not painlessly, as a result.

Time does not permit here an enumeration of all of the ills of education, formal and informal, of our day. But if we allow our imagination to move on down the avenues opened up in this fragmentary description of one laboratory of democracy, can we not discern how many of the most basic defects of current education would be overcome?

Critics agree that colleges, schools, and agencies of informal education generally lack a clear purpose or ideal around which all of the courses, departments, groups, or activities find their meaning and become organized into a synthesis. How can it be expected that students and participants will become motivated by a unified and compelling social purpose when their experiences are so atomistic, unrelated, and uninspiring? Can we not see how, in an agency where the development of the ideal and the skills of democracy was made the central and unifying purpose, those participating in the life of the agency might find an organizing center that would give larger purpose, meaning, and unity to their lives?

Critics also generally agree that the curriculum and program in schools and other educational agencies have tended to become stereotyped, sterile, and relatively unrelated to the needs of growing persons in a highly dynamic society. Can we not glimpse something of the transformation in curriculum and in teaching methods that would result if the major focus were shifted to the actual functions and relationships of people in the community, most of which are also embodied in the community life of the educational agency itself? No longer could it be said,

"Oh, school is school and life is life
and never the twain shall meet."

Instead, we could say,

"Oh, school is life and life is school
and ever the twain shall meet."

And so we might go on indicating how

teachers, curriculum, methods, agency and community relations, the organization of the educational agency itself—all these would be changed, not by a direct and frontal attack but by making them the new and indispensable prerequisites to the achievement of an all-important, all-consuming task in the service of democracy and of man.

SHALL WE EDUCATE OR ABDICATE?

The Lecture is really over, but some inner force compels me to add a footnote. It may possibly seem that I have built up a picture of what education should do in normal times rather than in these days of feverish preparations for national defense. That there may be not the slightest shadow of doubt or misunderstanding on this point, may I make a concluding statement.

It is the function of government in times of crisis to mobilize its resources for national unity and defense. "This unity is always most readily achieved," as John Foster Dulles has recently pointed out, "not through intellectual appeal, but by propagating an emotionalism of hate and fear."

At such a time there is a real tempta-

tion for educators and even for religious leaders to abandon their function in order "to whip up mass emotion" on behalf of unity in national affairs. This is a shortsighted policy. It is like building a house on the sand. It fails to recognize that the permanent, constructive forces are those of love, not hate; of light, not darkness; of understanding, not prejudice; of perspective, not shortsightedness; of courage, not fear or apprehension. If we relinquish, even though temporarily, reason, truth, intelligence, and understanding, we have abdicated our function as educators and religious leaders and are no more worthy to be called by these names. In the black-out of a world at war someone must guard and keep alight the dimly burning fires of reason, intelligence, and love. Arsenals of democracy are not only futile but horribly destructive without laboratories of democracy also working double shift to produce the essentials of the democratic spirit. For what will it profit democracy to gain a victory over all the dictators and lose its own soul!

To education and religion, in a peculiar way, is entrusted the soul of democracy in these fateful years.

I GRADUATE FROM SEMINARY

ANONYMOUS

The author of this paper has just graduated from one of our great American seminaries. He seriously questions whether the education he received there has given him the best preparation for his future work in the ministry.

His question is so pertinent that it calls for further exploration. The Editor has invited comment from a seminary graduate of one year standing, from a graduate

of fifteen years standing, and from the heads of two seminaries which are particularly interested in preparing men for the ministry. Their comments follow immediately after the article.

In the nature of the case, the author and the seminary would better remain anonymous.

Editor

Anyone graduating from a theological seminary in these days has a reasonable right to consider seriously what he has done. Not for a long time has any generation of preachers been confronted with a world in such a plight as ours. What, then, is in the minds of the young men who will be the church leaders of tomorrow? How do they evaluate the training which they have received in view of the present world need? Has their seminary experience really prepared them for effective ministries?

Naturally one person cannot answer these questions for all the embryo world savers, and even if he could the result would be rather pathetic. But, there are several problems which have arisen in the mind of one future minister with enough persistency to force him to review his seminary career.

I

Is ability in scholarly research the prerequisite for an effective ministry?

The seminary which I attended for three years is a peculiar hybrid of our educational system. It pretends to be both a graduate department of a university and a professional school for ministers. The result of this straddling is that it fails noticeably in both regards. My seminary seeks to maintain high scholarly standards of research in religion so that it may have equal ranking in this respect with any seminary in the country. The students who graduate from this seminary (I mention my own case because I feel that this experience can be reproduced in many other seminaries) realize only too little that it does not do what it pretends in the direction of scholarly research. The scholarly seminary may be a splendid location for the scholarly professor, but certainly not for the inexperienced student who has other aspirations. Many seminarians here major under the professor who has written the most books or whose addresses are most welcomed in certain college chapels. Few major in the department which will train them for the type

of position which they hope to gain upon graduation. The student body of my seminary has failed to see the vast breach between the training which they eagerly seek and the needs of the small rural church which they will most likely be glad to get upon graduation.

In many seminaries the philosophical area is held in awe, the historical area is viewed with curiosity and the practical area is looked down upon with pity. The students who major in the practical fields are snubbed intellectually because "they were the 'C' students of college." Unless one can think through the latest theological development with clarity, unless one enters into the late-at-night theological "huddle" with the persecuting zeal of Paul, one does not have a "message." I myself majored under one of the most recondite scholars of my seminary's faculty—so, I make my confession.

Moreover, how often has the practicing minister made use of the thesis which he wrote in seminary? The usual thesis in my seminary is directed primarily toward some research problem about which the professor in charge cares little and concerning which the student himself feels he could have spent his time more profitably. A close friend of mine, now working in the church school of a rather large and influential church, wrote his thesis on *an* aspect of the thought of the obscure and abstruse Jacob Boehme. I wrote upon a subject which is even less useful in the ministry than his. Probably the type of courses which are offered have much to do with this misuse of time and ability. How often have we searched for interesting courses in our seminary catalogue only to find: the "Pseudepigrapha," "Historical Bibliography," "A Reading Knowledge of Aramaic" and "Seminar in St. Theresa." Most often, as even the religious student knows, the needs of people are quite remote from such scholarly themes.

As I look back upon my three years of theological study I can easily see how my interests might have been centered toward

more professional ends. I know that I will not be expected to be a bulwark of learning—there are too many agencies that already supply that need in most communities. I will be looked upon as someone who should supply an aspect of life which others cannot give because of their different background. I hope to be the religious center of my community.

II

A seminary presumes to accomplish more than scholarly researches. *It seeks to inculcate an increased spirituality in its students.*

I am now paraphrasing the common chapel talk. But, does the modern seminary actually realize this basic end? Indeed the seminary should be a place somewhat cut off from the usual stresses of worldly life. It should be a place where the student can reflect, study and plan for the years ahead. I have not found it so. When the scriptures record that Jesus went out into a "wilderness" they aptly describe the environment of the modern seminary. Much of the time of the student is taken up in attending lectures and writing papers. Usually these papers have little to do with the spirituality of the student and are gained chiefly from the lectures that he has carefully written down in his notebook. In my second year I had twelve papers to write, each one of the required length for the credit hours of the course.

Again, the seminary thought itself a benefactor of unusual merit in my first year when it aided me in securing a position in a church some twelve miles from the seminary. The position enabled me to meet all of my seminary expenses, but it took about thirty hours a week for its fulfillment—this in addition to an already full schedule of study. Without that church position I would have been unable to attend seminary, but with it—well? And then, we were soundly scolded because we were absent so often from the regular chapel services.

My seminary life has taught me that one cannot gain in "spirituality" or "inner

resources" unless spiritual qualities are placed high in the seminary's scale of values. My seminary is more interested in research than it is in directing the lives of its students to those spiritual experiences which will outlast all our knowledge. Probably the lack of real spirituality on the part of the seminarians of some years ago is one of the chief causes for the church's apparent ineffectiveness. Will my class be better able to meet the onslaught of the new and more powerful forms of paganism?

III

Graduating as I am, I now wonder what effective techniques I have developed during these three years that will make my ministry more worth while.

Part of my training has been in the churches of a large city. This experience I found to be most valuable, except that the time spent was largely without expert guidance, indeed, without any guidance. Moreover, this practical work was not related to the work of the class room in thorough going manner. In the seminary I spoke with one vocabulary; in my field work I spoke with another. Then, too, the field experience failed to bring me real contacts with aspects of the church's program other than that of young people's work.

As I graduate from seminary I realize that I do not possess any of the techniques of scientifically appraising the needs of the community into which I shall go. My seminary is run on the assumption that all communities are pretty much alike and that people's needs have not changed for many, many years. The focus of attention is upon my needs, as if the ministry were simply a matter of my right thinking. There are many points, I know, in which my needs are the needs of others. But, I have always naively held that the ministry would be much more effective if it only knew what it was really attempting to do. Its goal must always be envisaged in terms of the actual needs of actual people. I must confess that I do not know thoroughly and scientifically for I have not

studied the needs of Bob, Bill and Jane. I have never had a course on "War and Peace." We stand in great want today of a seminary which will build its curriculum around the actual needs of people and not around a historical tradition.

As it is, the largest part of our training is directed toward the preaching pulpit. To many of us the conviction has long been present that the sermon as we understand it in the Protestant churches utterly fails to meet the religious needs of the American people. Psychologically we know that character habits are not gained in such a way. Practically we know that many sermons fail to give real aid. One minister in my city spoke last Sunday on the history of God's activity in the world. There were *three* stages, he said: God showed himself as creator; God appeared as a great man, and at the present God is working by his spirit. The pre-oration reasonably proved the doctrine of the trinity. As I read it I thought of my poor, unlearned father, struggling to make a living for my mother and brother (of war age). Scared of losing his factory position and not being able to supply many of the necessities of adequate home life, yet being beyond debt and owning his own home—having and not having—what impression would a sermon like that make upon him? Will I enter the ministry to preach sermons like that? If I do not care to preach like that will I be forced to?

IV

I will get my degree. Classes are over. My thesis has met the approval of a scholarly committee. My credits have been declared satisfactory. The invitations to the commencement exercise have been sent. Has it all been worthwhile? What shall I do now about furthering my education? Perhaps the seminary officials never intended that these three years should teach me much concerning the actual tasks of the ministry. Perhaps they thought that the "classics" were the best after all and that my "real education will come in the ministry." Soon you will see

me in your community. A strange man, strangely out of place in the modern scene. I am still eager to learn. Perhaps some day I shall "learn by experience."

COMMENTS ON "I GRADUATE FROM SEMINARY"

JOHN G. CRAIG*

A FAVORITE indoor sport of seminary students lies in criticizing the institution of learning under whose care they study. Harking back beyond the long year which has passed since I left Union Seminary, I can recall long and painfully reasoned dormitory discussions anent the failure of the curriculum to face the realities of life. "Why doesn't the faculty awaken to the realization that we are to minister to people and not to text-books and theories?" was a constant query. And with that query we faced a blank wall. For though the need for a life-centered approach to the ministry seemed so apparent to us, the administration and faculty failed to see it.

Could it be that we, in our ignorance, were wiser than they who taught us? Was it possible that our eyes, unclouded by Biblical, theological, and historical research, could see more clearly than the men who watched over our intellectual progress?

One year ago, I might possibly have answered "Yes" to these questions, with a sense of being capable to judge. Today, I should hesitate, and then say that I felt myself unable to give a direct answer. This, because one year of experience in a small parish has given me some perspective in the light of which I can attempt to measure the value of seminary training.

First of all, I should have to admit to a

*Graduate of Union Theological Seminary, New York, class of 1940. Minister of Forest Glen Congregational Church, Chicago.

thirsting for further taste of that for which we tended to criticize the seminary curriculum. *I do not know enough.* Constantly, I find myself lacking in a thorough knowledge of the background of my faith.

True, I cannot speak directly to my people of the theological doctrines and the historical intricacies of Christian tradition. Nor can I bring to them the latest steps in critical study of the Scriptures. They might not understand if I did, and almost certainly they would not appreciate. They attend church for other reasons. But I must know these things and know them better than I do. For I cannot fully understand myself and the faith that I profess without such knowledge.

The matter is not purely personal and selfish, however. I find that people in the church know very little, and want to know a great deal more about the basic beliefs and traditions of the Christian Church. And they welcome the sermonic interpretation of such doctrine and history as is important to a fuller understanding of their faith. The truest and heartiest response I have had in terms of comment, questions, and discussion came as the result of a series of three sermons on the subject of the Christian doctrine of man—and I must confess that I felt my greatest satisfaction and paradoxically, my greatest dissatisfaction in preaching that series.

It may well be that the methodical, problem-solving sermon has lost caste with the people in the pews. Listeners do sometimes become bored with air-tight reasoning. But our Christian faith is replete with doctrines which can be propounded from the pulpit in ringing tones, and which can set the hearts and minds of hearers singing a new song. Our faith is traditionally a preaching faith. The death-knell for the pulpit shall not ring, unless—yes, unless our seminaries become pure training grounds in methods, and cease their “over-concern” with intellectual pursuits.

In Henry Bellamann's novel, *King's*

Row, an old parish priest toys with the thought of days gone by when intellectual ecclesiastics debated the question as to how many angels could dance upon the point of a needle. It seems a useless task. Where is the reference to immediate life and the problem of home and community? But our minds must be bigger than the problems and the projects of the moment. We must think with the Infinite, else we lose ourselves in the current of the present. Father Flanagan longed for greater knowledge. In the face of a year's concern with parish matters, I do likewise.

Secondly, I should have to confess that during this year of active ministry, I have learned more of methods and techniques in dealing with people and programs than the seminary taught me in three years. This is not, however, to criticize the seminary training. Necessarily, the seminary atmosphere is artificial. To some degree, be it located in an urban center or in a semi-rural community, the seminary is withdrawn from the pathways of ordinary people. And reasonably so, the better to facilitate concern with timeless matters. The study of practical methods of the ministry must needs be undertaken in general terms. The local parish situation limits all general methods and techniques.

The seminary cannot teach us how to visit among our people, nor how to deal with a grief-stricken soul. It cannot coach us in meeting the problem of one-man rule, or of clicquishness. We cannot, beforehand, deal with the matter of gossip and well-meant inuendo. For parish problems center about personalities which we must come to understand before deciding upon an issue.

Without a doubt, seminary training in practical matters is valuable. But the value is limited. And greater emphasis in the seminary on such matters would seem to me to be a mistake.

Third. After a year in the pastorate, I find that my personal religious experience has been greater outside the confines of the seminary. One of my classmates once

remarked that he thought God looked down upon a student entering a seminary and said in essence, "Well, there he goes. There's not much chance of my contacting him for awhile. They'll take care of him for three years. I'll pick him up again when he graduates." It sounds a bit rough, and yet it contains an element of truth.

Say what we may, the seminary years are cushioned. The administration and faculty are like a mother bird hovering over the young charges lest harm come to them. Religious experience feeds on adversity. You have to buck up against some stone walls before you feel the need to fortify your faith. The religious life of the seminarian, as of any other human individual, will vary in depth in direct relation to the depth of the personal and social problems he faces.

In this matter the seminary cannot be expected to do a great deal. The individual who feels the need of a disciplined religious life will make use of what facilities the seminary offers and will devise others. Again, let it be said that general methods and techniques may be suggested in the classroom, but no amount of faculty ingenuity can manufacture the desire for religious experience. In that concern the individual stands alone before God.

My point here has not been to grant to the seminary a whitewashed record. Few, indeed, are the institutions of learning which can escape critical comment. I do feel, however, that seminaries have been unduly criticized for their concern with scholarship. Much better research rather than less research should be the object of the curriculum. With all its weaknesses, the seminary can give the willing student a foundation of knowledge which will stand him in good stead as he enters into the year-round task of ministering to a parish.

But let us not expect too much from the seminary. It can give a sure foundation of knowledge. The foundation of faith lies in the experience of the individual. Ministers are made by the church; the seminary trains them for a more effective

ministry. I look to the church to further strengthen the ministry to which I have given myself.

ALBERT W. PALMER*

I HAVE great personal sympathy with the viewpoint expressed by the anonymous seminary graduate whose article appears above. A few years out of Seminary I felt much as he does and I sometimes reflect with amusement that I am now teaching subjects in my own theological school which were either badly taught or not taught at all in the divinity school which I entered forty years ago this September!

The subjects of church administration, worship, pastoral counseling, and the minister's use of the Bible, all of which I now teach, were not even offered in that venerable institution, one of the best in the country! Homiletics was taught in an utterly wooden manner, the public speaking instruction was taken as a joke and the one real course in the practical field which scored was the course in sermon criticism, which was conducted with vigor and merciless reality! Subjects now taught in many leading seminaries, such as religious drama, religious education, personality problems and mental hygiene, church and community analyses, theology for laymen, radio speech, biographies, sociology of religion, the rural church, youth programs, field work problems, were not even mentioned, probably not dreamed of, in those days of required Hebrew and minute German higher criticism!

And yet, somehow, the men of that generation have seemed to score fairly well in the ministry! Fellows whom I remember struggling through what now seems to me a very inadequate training are today rendering good service in prominent positions as preachers, leaders of

*President of The Chicago Theological Seminary.

church organizations, heads of colleges or teachers. A list of them would surprise you—as it does me. Something vital and stimulating apparently percolated through into their personalities out of this three year grind of a higher-criticism-centered curriculum with its endless discussion of the Biblical ideas of Wellhausen, Bernhard Weiss, Johannes Weiss, Duhm, Pfeiderer et al. and theology based on Lotze, Schleiermacher, Ritschl and Harnack.

To be plunged into all this, after graduating from the most secular of all state universities, was an intellectual strain and an emotional test of no small severity. Bismarck once said that, of all German students, one-third died from overwork and another third from dissipation, but that the remaining third governed Germany! (Perhaps, if the lost two-thirds could have been salvaged, Germany would not now have to call in Hitler, who never went to a university at all!)

The point I am making is that the old theological curriculum, while deficient as a balanced diet, did have some vitamins in it and apparently succeeded as a discipline or, at least, as a test of power to survive! Given that discipline and demonstrated survival power, it seemed to be assumed the graduate could master all the practical techniques of his professional life by plain common sense or trial and error methods. I understand this is still the theory of theological education which is largely accepted abroad.

But is it not an unnecessarily costly and clumsy procedure? Why should not the theological curriculum be so organized as to provide both discipline and a test of survival power and, at the same time, an effective mastery and first hand knowledge of the tools and real problems of the job. Not all research has to be conducted in a library and centered about subjects of remote scholastic erudition! We are finding in our seminary that valuable and scholarly research can equally well concern itself with problems of community life, race relations, mental adjustment,

worship and the techniques of teaching or of counseling. All these are down the pastor's alley and students heading for the practical ministry should be encouraged to write their theses in fields like these, as well as theology, church history and Bible. If, then, the thesis is not simply bound and sunk without trace in the measureless depths of the library but made the basis of an oral conference with a faculty committee where the student defends and explains his thesis, there is good reason to feel that the research and organizing processes involved in writing it have been a worthwhile discipline.

When it comes to the development of the student's spiritual life as well as his scholarly competence, the problem becomes at once both more important and more difficult. In the old days, I suppose, the student was expected to come already on fire with religious zeal. All he needed was scholarly organization and equipment. Now it often is the student himself who needs conversion. Some would even hint that it is the professor! Certainly there is no longer any unified and taken-for-granted pattern of spiritual experience. The seminary faces a very important problem of helping the student make adjustment to the theological thunderstorms of this era and keep the fire of personal religious faith and vocational zeal burning brightly on his altar at the same time.

In seminaries of modern tradition and background this should be taken more account of in the classroom teaching than in the past, but the most hopeful approach is through informal extra-curricular activities. The quarterly seminary "retreat," the worship services planned and carried out by joint student-faculty committees, the choice of speakers brought in from the outside, all have an important influence.

Here also the student's field-work ought to have an important contribution to make. The churches and other institutions where such field-work takes place need to be carefully selected and the reciprocal relationship between them and the student

clearly understood. This means a field-work supervisor, or several of them, on the seminary faculty and a field-work seminar where the students wrestle with the problems turned up on the field and seek to relate them to the formal instruction in other classrooms. Handled in this way, field-work may become not just a meal ticket but a genuine laboratory experience in religion. "Keep your head in the stars but your feet in the mud!" was the realistic advice Graham Taylor once gave to a theological student. It is good advice to theological seminaries, too. There needs to be a constant interpretative reaction going on between the mud of the city streets or rural lanes, the common clay of humanity, and the high subjects taught in a theological curriculum.

JAMES S. CHUBB*

MY first reaction to the paper of the seminary graduate is one of profound thankfulness for his inadequate feeling as he faces his future. This is a sign that he is nervous, the kind of "haunting" feeling that an athlete feels before an important event. I still have that feeling of inadequacy after a number of years of active work, and my feeling cannot be blamed to the seminary, because I have been out in active work several times longer than I was in school.

From this range, I could make fun of the young graduate by saying that "he would learn." However, most of us did not like this attitude in older men when we graduated, so I shall pass over that emotional attitude for what I believe is a better attitude. That attitude is this: how grateful we should be that young men are thinking of the assets and debits of their education, just before they start their career. That gives both teachers and re-

ligious leaders on the field something tangible to ponder and work out.

When I think through, some things are clear. I am deeply indebted to the seminaries of the church for learning. Great hearted scholars stimulated me immensely. A love of learning for the sake of learning was generated by the seminaries. Intellectual fearlessness was a heritage of the seminary training. I met great men who were not afraid of issues, nor were they afraid to be on the popular side of causes. Great men of the field of religion and from other walks of life came to the seminary, and those whom I had known afar off became personally known. All of this was good; it was very good.

The greatest need of my ministry, and I think it is of any minister, was a clear grasp of the Christian message and teaching. The historic teaching of the church, the brilliant insights from the Bible, the historical interpretation of the Christian religion, the church and social movements as they are inter-related—this great content of the Christian message was well given to me in the seminary. I have always had something to preach—both intellectually respectable and intellectually progressive as well.

These are the greatest things I got from the seminary. They were fine and I wish it to be understood that I would go to the seminary again, if knowing what I do, the start was to be made again.

Other phases of the work of the pastorate were not so well covered by the seminary. They were learned by the "pick and shovel" method of experience. It has always seemed to me that the seminary should have laid more stress on the pastoral office. The emphasis in our school did not direct me to such heavy pastoral tasks as staying with the broken hearted until peace of soul came. It did not prepare me to carry the heavy load of parish sorrows, nor was I properly trained nor even warned that the most dramatic work of my pastorate would be in the counseling room where men and women were desperately trying to find a "way," and

*Graduate of Boston University School of Theology, class of 1925. Minister of First Methodist Church, Baldwin, Kansas; Instructor at Baker University and Lecturer at Garrett Biblical Institute.

"forgiveness" and courage to go ahead. It would have been well for me to have majored in clinical psychology or in counseling, as well as in philosophy and church history.

I was just off to a good start when the depression that never ended came. There was no way for the seminary to prepare me for this shock. But it can and should train men to face the community problem as a whole. Vision is lacking in most of our communities. Morale is low. The typical attitude is, So what? It takes more than preaching to meet this. Class work, community projects, ingenuity and resourcefulness are essential. The least any minister must be in such a place is a personal leaven who mingles with all people; but he will be a godsend if he is a promoter and builder of community life as well. Most young men will start in just such a community. Many of them will live their lives in such places. They can be the most important person. So I must string along with the writer of the article in his yearning for a better training in community service and engineering. This is not the minister's technical field but he must know more about it than most people. Thus he becomes one of the "indispensable" men.

Then, it seems to me that the writer has something in the section on "spirituality." Men of the spirit are now and have always been the real men of the Christian movement. This kind of life comes as much from personal testimony and personal discipline as from any other source. Much of my understanding of prayer was started by an afternoon session at Boston, where Dr. Parks gave one of his fine lectures on the subject. He opened up the methods and the rightful expectations from a disciplined prayer life. It was his testimony as well as his evidence that opened to me the field.

A teacher at Northwestern University took time off in an afternoon seminar to tell what religion meant to him personally. He had found it to be a power that lifted, guided and strengthened him in every day

tasks. We saw the heavens open that afternoon! There is a craving on the part of most young professional men for the experience and testimony of their teachers and leaders. This is the material that gives specific content to our own religion, and it shows us the price that must be paid for a "working" religion.

I have been a teacher, as well as a minister, for a good many years. The best reactions from the students that have made good have so often come not from the content of the course, but from "that day" when they got a glimpse of personal living, religious experiences, and moral discipline necessary to achieve the good life. I am sure that more of this element could easily be introduced in to our seminary life, both formally and informally.

Then, of course, an intimate introduction to the lives of contemporary religious men like Stanley Jones. Kagawa, Lester, Helms, and Rufus Jones is always stimulating. Deep religion inspires young men to deep religion. Classes are valuable and must not be underrated, but so is deep abiding creative religious spirituality.

I would add one other point to his paper. He must not underrate the value of his training in church organization and educational method. Whether a pastor likes it or not, he sets the pace and the point of view for his Sunday school. He is the inspiring head of the whole institution, or else he is just a belligerent nuisance to it all. It pays the youthful pastor to be a student of the best project and course methods which he can take out to his own corps of teachers and leaders. One learns by experience that Sunday school teaching and point of view may, unfortunately, be a vaccination against the real thing in religion. So the minister must be a skilled organizer and educator.

So let me hasten to say, God bless the restlessness and the sense of need on the part of our young men. Human powers alone will not build that church to which you go. God, great human living, your own sacrificial living and tireless work will go far beyond anything you get in

school or receive in training. Yet—it seems to me that our schools must put a more adequate stress on skills for personal work in the pastoral office, and we must never cease to bring our youth into contact with the deeply spiritual laymen, laywomen and ministers of the church. Their kind of spirituality will not have the lectured finesse of trained teachers in our seminaries, but they will have the honorable scars of battle on them. That, my brethren, is catching.

LUTHER A. WEIGLE*

I AM much interested in the statement of the seminary graduate. I do not know either the seminary or the man, so my comment is not to be taken as an appraisal of either. He is clearly a young man of great promise and good judgment, and the seminary is probably one of the best. Obviously, it has not failed in his case.

A divinity school, which is an integral part of a great university, has two functions which should be clearly defined and kept distinct. It is, on the one hand, a graduate professional school for the education of men for service in the Christian ministry. As such it provides a three-year course leading to the Degree of Bachelor of Divinity. It is, on the other hand, a school for graduate study and research in fields cognate to religion. As such it maintains close relations to the graduate school, and usually there is some interlocking of personnel between it and the graduate school.

In the graduate professional course leading to the B.D. degree the curriculum should be student-centered rather than subject-centered. Its aim is to develop certain abilities and resources within the student and it uses subject matter as means to this end. It is not necessary, therefore, to cover in class-room procedures the full extent of any subject. The subject, however important it may be,

is not an end in itself as it forms a part of the theological curriculum; it is a means to the development of the student. The teacher can so deal with selected aspects of the subject that the student will acquire the interest and the necessary equipment to do further work in this field for himself.

The point may be illustrated by the field of the interpretation or exegesis of the New Testament. It is not essential or desirable that teacher and students should together undertake the exegesis of every chapter and verse of the New Testament; but it is important that by the exegesis of significant selections the student should learn the methods of New Testament interpretation and be given a sufficient basis for his own future study and use of the New Testament.

The curriculum for the B.D. degree, moreover, should be directed toward the service which the student is to render as a minister of the Gospel. This is professional education and it seeks to fit students to apply knowledge and skill to human needs. It is in this respect akin to education for other professions—for example, the medical profession. The curriculum of the medical school is directed, not so much toward the cultivation of the sciences for their own sake, as toward the application of these sciences to the cure of illness and the prevention of disease. So the curriculum of the theological seminary will include the study of psychology, not to the full extent of its problems, but as a basis for understanding, helping, and working with people; sociology, not as a systematic science of society, but as a resource for understanding and dealing with social problems; church history, not that the minister may know all of its details or himself become an historian, but that he may gain an intelligent comprehension of the spirit and strength of the Christian movement throughout history and in the world today.

This principle is open to abuse, I grant. An attempt to make education, at any level, narrowly and directly utilitarian,

*Dean of the Divinity School, Yale University.

defeats itself. It becomes mere training. Education for the Christian ministry must be more than the mastery of selected texts, rules, and devices, chosen because it is believed that they will work. But it must not, on the other hand, be merely theoretical or academic, out of touch with life.

The B.D. curriculum should include provision of training through practice under supervision. Just as medical education includes provision for clinical training and service as an interne, education for the Christian ministry must be imparted through practice in the work of a minister.

At Yale, a graduate class, for men who had already secured the B.D. degree, was organized in 1879, and we have always had graduate study and research in the general field of Religion since that time. In 1919 and 1920 the present organization of relationships between the Divinity School and the Graduate School were worked out.

The development of graduate studies in the general field of Religion may move in either of two directions:—(a) the organization of a department in the graduate school staffed by men who have no connection with the divinity school; or, (b) a clearer definition of the responsibility for graduate studies carried by men who hold their primary appointment in the divinity school.

The policy here at Yale has been to take the second of these two directions. The work of the Divinity School as a graduate professional school and the promotion of graduate studies and objective research in the field of Religion are mutually supporting. If it be granted that occasionally a man is to be found who can not teach in a professional curriculum and at the same time retain his interest and ability to guide students in graduate research, the great majority of teachers will do their best work under the stimulus of this two-fold opportunity. The Divinity School needs the spirit of scholarship which is fostered by graduate study; and the interest in graduate studies in the field of Religion is best maintained by those

who have some concern for the profession of the ministry. Here at Yale two departments of the Graduate School are almost wholly staffed by men who hold their primary appointment in the Divinity School.

It is necessary to keep the two types of work clearly defined in aim, method, and content. We have found it best to have distinct courses for students in the graduate class who are candidates for the M.A. and Ph.D. Degrees. The aim of such graduate study is the cultivation of scholarship and the extension of knowledge in fields cognate to Christian theology and to the work of the Christian church. In the fulfilment of this aim, the work of the school is to be described as academic rather than professional; it is a graduate school, fostering the same interest in the subjects committed to it that the graduate school of the university fosters in the various fields of human knowledge which it undertakes to cultivate.

From this point of view, the curriculum of the school may even be said to be subject-centered. It seeks to develop scholars and teachers, but its best method of directing the education of students to this end is for the members of the faculty to associate these students with themselves as they carry on the work of research, experiment, productive scholarship, and creative thinking and writing in the fields for which they are responsible. In fulfilment of this aim, the school offers not so much a curriculum as a variety of curricula suited to the needs, aims and capacities of the individual students whom it admits to its fellowship of religion and learning. It should select these students carefully, admitting only those of proved ability and genuine promise of scholarship achievement.

If the distinction that I have been seeking to make between the function of the divinity school as a graduate professional school and its function as a part of the graduate school of the university is clearly maintained, most of the difficulties about which the seminary graduate writes will

tend to disappear. Personally, I believe that candidates for the B.D. degree should major not in a field of subject matter, but in the work of a vocation. I believe that the B.D. curriculum should be planned as a whole and the faculty organized as a whole to deal with curriculum problems. The departmental plan of organization is not adapted to the needs of theological seminaries. As a method of organization of the faculty, it introduces an unnecessary hierarchy and sets up the unnecessary authority of the "head of the department." As a method of budget-making, it issues in needless and undesirable competition between departments. Educationally, it tends to undue specialization and to foster the mistaken idea that subjects are ends in themselves rather than a means to the student's education.

I am opposed to the requirement of the customary B.D. thesis. If one is written, it should be because the student elects to do so and credit should be given for it as for a course. I am opposed to the requirement of term papers without some method of supervision which insures that the requirement made upon the student is not out of balance. It should be impossible, in any institution, for a student to be required to write twelve term papers in a

given year.

I believe thoroughly in the student's training through practice under supervision—but it must be under supervision and with guidance. Thirty hours a week of such field work is entirely too much without a reduction of the academic schedule. It is our practice at Yale to require students who hold major positions in field work to reduce their academic schedule to three-fourths of the regular schedule and to take four years for the completion of the work for the B.D. degree.

I am in sympathy with what this graduate says about the work of the ministry, and the work of the seminary as it educates men for the ministry, being centered "about the actual needs of people." I have just two words of caution on that point. One is that to meet the needs of people is not necessarily to ignore historical tradition; the other is that the word "needs" is a weasel word of dubious worth in educational philosophy.

Finally, I would urge upon the seminary graduate not to undervalue the opportunity which the sermon affords. If it be claimed that too many sermons fail, that is no reason why his should fail. Somehow I have the feeling that his will not fail.

Annual Meeting of the RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Oberlin, Ohio, May 4 and 5, 1941

THE Annual Meeting of the Association began at nine o'clock Sunday morning, May 4th, and terminated at one o'clock Monday afternoon, May 5th.

REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

Dr. Harrison S. Elliott, President of the Association, opened the meeting with a report of his recent trip. Union Theological Seminary had released him, on salary, from the latter part of January to April third to travel in the interest of the Association. During this period he visited thirty cities in twenty states, and spoke or led conferences at a hundred and twenty separate appointments.

The Program Committee, under the chairmanship of Dr. Stewart G. Cole, had laid plans, and a finance committee, under the chairmanship of Mr. Israel S. Chipkin, had raised funds for travel and expenses. The warmest appreciation was expressed to Messrs. Cole and Chipkin and their committees for the services rendered. A mimeographed statement, prepared by Dr. Elliott for a New York meeting on the results of the trip, was distributed.

In summary, Dr. Elliott reported:

1. The inter-relationship of religious education and public education was found to be quite pressing in all centers which he visited, and the R.E.A. meetings, in many cases, provided the first opportunity for this problem to be faced on an inter-faith and inter-educational basis. Through the R.E.A., people could meet in a fellowship where they would not have to vote or take other action, but could explore mutual viewpoints and examine proposals critically. In the field of higher education (Dr. Elliott had visited nearly a score of colleges and universities), there seemed

prevalent a sense of need in the personal life of students for some integrating center, for some spiritual orientation in a sustaining faith.

2. It may be possible, he concluded, that the R.E.A. has an opportunity at the present time comparable to that when it was founded, the opportunity now being to face the meaning and place of religion in life as a whole—and therefore in the total educational experience of children, youth, and adults. This is the large need of our time, just as the problem of educational method in religious work was the task of the R.E.A. in its earlier formative years. The secularization of life has reached almost a saturation point.

3. We must analyze this problem definitely, Dr. Elliott said, and work functionally in those areas in which policy and program are being formed. This means working in various communities in various ways on particular problems—always on invitation, of course. It means more than development of methodology; it means basic thinking about practical problems.

In the discussion which followed, a strong conviction was expressed that in this area—seeking the meaning of religion in the total educational experience—lies the growing opportunity of the R.E.A. Various suggestions were made, stressing the need of dealing with issues that are practical rather than merely theoretical, some feeling that a major concern such as the one suggested should be made the framework within which the Association should operate for a number of years rather than attempting to select a new theme each year.

It was generally agreed that this should be done, and that the area of interest, or the "theme," of the Association for the

next several years would be *"The Place of Religion in the Total Educational Experience of Children, Youth, and Adults."* Within this area, or rather, in this frame of reference, many particular problems could be studied. This is a continuance of the current year's topic, *"Religious Education and Public Education,"* in a little broader way.

It was recommended that a Central Planning Committee be appointed to co-operate with local groups in the exploration of possibilities in planning experiments and appraisal of results. Better that these ends be sought through utilization of local agencies, as results thus achieved would have greater significance for the community.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

Various reports of standing committees were given and explored for their contributions to questions of major strategy ahead of us:

Dr. F. Ernest Johnson presented the report of the Committee on Policy and Strategy, which had been appointed at the February meeting of the Board. Major items in this report were as follows:

1. that the Association in its program for the coming year capitalize to the fullest extent the itinerary of Professor Elliott;
2. that in dealing with the problem of the relation of religion to public education regional groups be encouraged to develop their policy and program in the light of the actual local situation faced and the alternatives that present themselves;
3. that an effort be made to organize the Association regionally on a general membership basis;
4. that the unity of the Association be preserved by making the annual meeting and the magazine as vital and important as possible;
5. (a) that relationships with professional associations of educators be cultivated in line with the current program emphases of the Association;
- (b) that consideration be given to the

desirability of holding either annual or regional meetings of the Association immediately before or immediately after annual gatherings of national professional societies such as the Progressive Education Association and the American Association of School Administrators;

6. that the matter of seeking memberships for the Association among public educators be not pressed until some experience has been had with these procedures of cooperation;

7. that the Association should, if possible, secure the release of a member of the faculty of one of the graduate theological schools for the purpose of making an itinerary similar to that recently made by Professor Elliott.

Professors Ernest J. Chave and Laird T. Hites had been requested by the Board in February to canvass a number of members, to discover whether funds might be available to increase the number of issues of RELIGIOUS EDUCATION from four a year to six, if it seemed advisable to do so. In their letter they sought counsel on three points: (1) on regional chapters; (2) on increasing the issues of the Journal; and (3) on the general program of the Association. Dr. Chave reported the general contents of the sixty replies that had been received to date:

1. Practically every reply favored the development of regional chapters; a few suggesting that they should be informally organized with occasional rather than stated meetings.

2. On increasing the number of issues, opinion was almost exactly divided between four and six; those who favored continuing with four, however, tending to favor an increase in the number of pages in each issue as far as finance permitted. A total of more than \$350 a year for three years had been pledged to finance the two extra issues, if the advance were made.

3. On the program of the Association, no consensus of opinion appeared, further than that the present topic of study is very important and should be continued and

that it might profitably be widened to include the total experience of the child, not merely the school and church experience. Other suggested emphases were:

More reports of experiments in the Journal;

That the R.E.A. consider itself a "thinking" organization rather than an "action group";

That we should cooperate more with other agencies;

That we recognize and define the differences and relationships between character education and religious education;

That whatever we start we should carry through far enough to make it useful.

The report of the Program Committee was read by Dr. Stewart G. Cole. Dr. Cole added the comment that the present setup of the committee involves two problems: (1) It is very difficult for a committee to work effectively unless it is centralized; and equally difficult for a centralized committee to take full account of local interests and needs. (2) There is concern for a common theme, or major issue, around which to concentrate our efforts; and equal concern for a wide range of issues that are important in particular places. In the discussion which followed, several points were made:

1. That since many places are not going to concentrate upon any single problem, however important, perhaps the committee should prepare a number of syllabi on a variety of important subjects. The Association for the Study of Group Work has a dozen such syllabi, each designed for seminar study over a number of sessions.

2. The Committee might endeavor to aid any regional group on its particular problem or interest.

3. Many members are isolated, or so few in number in a place that organization of a regional chapter is impossible. They have, many of them, received genuine stimulus from the current syllabus on "Religious Education and Public Education."

4. With due regard for syllabi or study aids, the fellowship value of a group meeting is perhaps the most important aspect, especially if the fellowship involves inter-faith elements.

The report of the Membership Committee was read by Professor Hites in the absence of the chairman.

Report of the Executive Committee, which had been made officially by Professor Chave to the Board, was distributed.

Report of the Editorial Committee was read by Professor Frank M. McKibben.

Report of the Treasurer for the fiscal year ending March 31st was presented by Dr. Hites. It showed all bills paid to date, and a small balance on hand. Report of the auditor was also offered to anyone who might care to examine it.

Report of the debt-liquidating committee was made by Professor Hugh Harts-horne. The indebtedness accumulated through past years has now been entirely cleared.

The Sunday afternoon session began with a discussion as to the nature of the R.E.A. Two points of view were presented: (1) Is this a fellowship of people committed to free inquiry and therefore interested in promoting a process which includes opportunities for cooperation by people representing various shades of opinion on critical issues, or (2) is it an association committed to a viewpoint which might be summarized as liberal in religion, progressive in education, and democratic in process?

After several people had contributed to the discussion, another analysis of the choice of roads facing the R.E.A. was presented: We can either cooperate with existing ecclesiastical institutions, some of them more conservative than others; or we can ally ourselves definitely with such forward-looking forces as, for example, those engaged in progressive public school education. A comment was made to the effect that until we can identify clearly the values we call religious, and describe them

in operational terms, we can expect little cooperation from forward-looking public school people.

It was generally agreed that the R.E.A. is not an evangelistic group, but rather a fellowship in which everyone can speak his mind freely and discuss fundamental questions, on some of which we shall differ widely; and that the Association must at all costs continue to be an inter-faith association which takes up living issues and discusses them on a free platform. The spirit of the Association is to be found in liberalism, democracy, and progressive education. Because of this, we are not likely to obtain support from the more orthodox Jewish or Christian groups. Anyone is welcome if he comes in the spirit of free inquiry, and is willing to submit any question to critical investigation.

Still further it was suggested that the important thing about the R.E.A. is not a platform but a process, that its essential genius is to be found in the fundamental process of free inquiry that the Association employs.

At this point a Catholic friend arose to contribute the suggestion that in his judgment the process of reasoning during the afternoon had not been particularly productive nor disciplined, and contrasted it with what he termed the more logical processes that would have been followed by a group of Catholic educators. An interesting exploration of differences in type of intellectual inquiry was here possible, but the time available made it seem wise to return to the development of the discussion.

In summary, Dr. Elliott again restated the two processes which the R.E.A. could employ in developing its work:

The first would be to go into a community with a set of predetermined values and help the people of the community evaluate their work on the basis of that system of values.

The second would be to go into a community with a process that would help the community to understand the values

held by various groups, to be critical of them without intruding upon them, and to work out a positive and cooperative strategy for the religious education of children, young people, and adults. Dr. Elliott felt that this second approach was the one he had used on his trip, and that the response had seemed most encouraging.

On Sunday evening the discussion centered about the question: Shall we set up a central planning committee and regional commissions to work upon significant issues, and if so, how? A major question was whether such commissions should operate on the basis of providing help to local communities, or as survey commissions whose task would be to study general problems apart from local groups.

It was pointed out again and again that research and surveys cost money and time, and that the R.E.A. as an organization would not have the money or the free leadership to conduct regional surveys or to evolve methods of evaluation, although many of our members are constantly doing precisely that.

The need of further field trips by the president or other leaders was stressed. Perhaps when we can again employ a Secretary for full service, we may render more of this community service; perhaps someone might be freed like Dr. Elliott was this year to render field service, as recommended in the report of the committee on policy and strategy above. Such a person might become a liaison officer between the local chapters and the Association. He would discover and stimulate; help set up and plan; and later return to advise and cooperate in evaluation. It was pointed out that many places are now ready and eager for appraisal; few are prepared for significant experimentation.

Out of the discussion, these major conclusions seemed to emerge:

1. That our major efforts be directed toward assisting local groups to ask the right questions, to know what kind of data to collect, to use proper methods and

criteria of evaluation—not to help them do the job, but to offer counsel that will help get at the roots of their practical problem.

2. That regional commissions set up about such centers as New York and Chicago might well prepare syllabi providing such guidance, and, whenever possible, provide some direct consultative guidance to local groups through attendance of a representative at meetings of the group.

3. These regional commissions would need to cooperate closely with a central program planning committee, whose task would be partly that of identifying certain areas that would need continuous development and stimulating the organization of immediate commissions for work in such problem areas.

Dr. Edward W. Blakeman spoke on the importance of the field of higher education, suggesting that the place of religion in the total experience of the college or university was a hot spot, that hundreds of religious leaders and administrators were deeply concerned and needed guidance, and that a strong effort in this field would be immensely rewarding. It was moved and carried that one of the co-operating commissions be appointed in this area.

Dr. Edna Acheson suggested that in her local community, Syracuse, the relationship of religion and of religious forces to a number of community activities and agencies was now in the foreground. Dr. Emanuel Gamoran described a similar situation in Cincinnati, and the need of clear thinking leading to coordinated activity. It was the action of the group that there be appointed a commission to operate in this area of inter-relationships among agencies in local communities.

In the discussion which followed, it was pointed out that in several places community agency representatives will call upon religious groups for consultation during this next year; that on a nationwide basis, for example, the National Conference of Jews and Christians and the R.E.A. had already, through the rela-

tionships of their leaders, been sharing common understandings and problems. Other organizations mentioned were, the Christian and Hebrew Associations, the National Council on Religion in Higher Education, the International Council of Religious Education, social service, juvenile delinquency and similar agencies, and the Progressive Education Association. The possibility of joint or contiguous meetings was raised.

Dr. Hartshorne seemed to summarize the feeling of the group in his recommendation that, rather than appoint a separate commission to explore our relationships to various national bodies, for the next year we limit ourselves to actual conflict situations and common tasks, and that the central planning commission to be appointed should take up problems of organizational inter-relationships as we find our paths crossing those of other organizations.

The question of membership fees was discussed at considerable length. Our basic membership fee is \$4.00 a year, but new members pay \$2.50 the first year; students in residence pay half the regular fee; subscribers who are not members (libraries) pay \$3.50; and some people maintain a contributing membership of \$10.00 or more a year. When a church or other organization maintains a group of ten or more members, paid for with a single check, the fee is \$2.50 for each one. Quite a variety.

Members present who came from immediate contacts with local groups seemed to feel that the present basic fee of \$4.00 a year was too large for many people who might otherwise become members. After a good deal of discussion the following suggestions were referred to the Executive Committee for further evaluation and possible action:

1. The possibility of a reduced fee for local group members, possibly taking advantage of the present provision for a \$2.50 membership for a group of ten or more, but possibly making the fee \$3.00,

fifty cents to be retained by the local organized group.

2. The necessity of continuing the fee at the present level until it becomes reasonably evident that a reduction would not result in a reduced total income.

At a further discussion of the content of RELIGIOUS EDUCATION, these suggestions met with considerable favor:

1. That the forum method might be employed more extensively, readers being invited to comment upon articles published.

2. That a section of the Journal might be devoted to descriptions and news items of what is emerging in local communities (a la *Christian Century* news section).

3. That a few pages of each Journal be given to abstracts of important current articles or books, presenting in usable language trends in education and religion. An illustration would be, reports of methods and experiments in the field of delinquency prevention.

4. That the Journal be published in six issues, beginning 1942, instead of continuing as a quarterly.

Mr. Israel Chipkin reported on the travel fund which had been raised to finance Dr. Elliott's trip. Total receipts from contributions and honoraria amounted to \$851.52 and total expenses were \$655.42, leaving a balance on hand of \$196.10. It was voted that a portion of this balance be earmarked for stenographic service to Dr. Elliott during the coming year; and that the remainder be held as the nucleus of a fund for further travel in the Association's interest.

In rather rapid succession the following motions were passed:

1. That the Program Committee and the Membership Committee be merged into a new committee whose actual name is to be left to the Executive Committee (but often referred to in this discussion as the Central Planning Committee). This committee is to have the responsi-

bility of directing the program activity of the Association, the organization and guidance of commissions, the preparation of syllabi and other materials, and the enlistment of membership in the Association. President Elliott, with Messrs. Hamilton, Hellstrom, Dushkin, and Cole, were appointed as a nucleus of the committee, and empowered to select a chairman and to enlarge the committee by addition of such other members as might seem desirable.

2. That we express to Union Theological Seminary our appreciation for the release of our President, and assure the Seminary of the value of the service rendered.

3. That the President appoint a committee to approach Dean Colwell, of the Divinity School of the University of Chicago, with a request that Professor Chave be released for a period of time, preferably next autumn, to travel in the interest of the Association. (Note: This has been done, and Professor Chave will be available for several weeks during the autumn quarter.)

4. That the Association send greetings to its Honorary President, Dr. George A. Coe.

5. Dr. Hartshorne reported for the Nominating Committee. (The entire list of officers and directors is shown on the second, third, and fourth covers of this Journal.)

The Association then turned to a discussion of the general theme and issue for the year ahead. As phrased earlier in the meeting, it is "The Place of Religion in the Total Educational Experience." In the course of considerable discussion three points were clarified:

1. For a great many years the Association has tried to infuse religion with educational methodology. That is no longer to remain our primary emphasis. Our focus now is on *religion*, what it can contribute to education; and the meaning and place of religion in the total educational experience of children, youth, and adults.

We are now seeking to help education become religious.

2. This general task continues the theme of the past year, setting it in a larger frame of reference.

3. We shall not allow ourselves to escape into vague generalities, but hold constantly to specific, concrete situations and movements. This viewpoint was forcefully presented by Shaver, Brickner, Chave, Hartshorne, Elliott, and several others.

Dr. Elliott, in summary, presented ten areas which had been suggested for local or for cooperating commission explorations:

1. The need for a community approach to problems, and the pooling of community resources.

2. A critical study of leisure time.

3. The need to follow through some community experiments in the use of public school released time, and appraise them.

4. The private school situation needs study: teaching of religion in many private schools is not all that could be desired.

5. The federal government is moving more and more into education. The effect upon child life needs seriously to be considered.

6. The kind of religion that is (or should be) the basis for religious education.

7. The "unorganized" church—radio and film.

8. Theological education and training of leaders for religion and religious education.

9. Alongside of released time projects, the whole question of high school credit for studies in religion.

10. An exploration of what can be done in and through the public schools with regard to religion. A claim is often made that public schools are teaching much religion in informal ways. True or not true?

11. Someone reminded the group that religious forces need to face specifically

what the war is doing and is going to do, to children—what will be the needs of children and youth in the ten years ahead? What religion will they need, and how will it develop?

All of these points, it was stressed, revolve about the problem of "Total Educational Experience." The Association will continue the primary emphasis it has followed this year—"Religious Education and Public Education"—but broaden the scope of its study.

A motion by Dr. Shaver was voted after considerable discussion and elaboration of understanding, which stated that the Central Planning Committee be asked to appoint cooperating commissions on as many of the following specific issues in the field of public school education and religion as possible.

1. Released time.

2. Credit plans.

3. The teaching of religion in public schools.

4. Latent religious resources in public schools.

5. The balanced school day plan.

6. Leisure time, increasing federal control.

7. The principle of specific approach.

The character of the annual meeting for 1942 was then discussed. The suggestion was made that three or four larger area meetings be planned at about the same time to care for the study of "Program"; and that the Annual Meeting itself be largely like the present one, an occasion for the discussion of program and strategy. Special effort should be made to bring together more key people from regional chapters to report progress made. It was then voted that the program of the 1942 Annual Meeting be planned along the same lines as the present one, with the understanding however, that:

1. We do not thus commit ourselves to a permanent policy;

2. If the Central Planning Committee sees issues and data arising that should be considered, the committee should feel

free to schedule one or two days for a discussion of the progress arising from the work of the year.

It was strongly stated by some that next year's meeting should not become just a business meeting, but should include a consideration of the wider issues of general program and action. It was also felt that the program might profitably be divided into two sections, that one day at least should be devoted to strategy and policy, and the business part consid-

ered separately so that people not particularly concerned with that aspect might find it possible to participate in the general meeting with profit.

The most convenient dates for the Annual Meeting of 1942 seemed to be May 4, 5, and 6; though final decision on time and place was left in the hands of the Executive Committee and the President with power.

Rabbi Barnett R. Brickner adjourned the meeting with prayer.

BOOK REVIEWS

BARTH, KARL, *The Church and the Political Problem of Our Day*. Scribners, 1939.

This polemic in eight theses represents Barth's arraignment of Nazi Germany. When it first appeared Hitler had already violated the Munich Pact and was well-embarked on his conquest of the Continent. In this brochure Barth tacitly admits that he and other churchmen had originally failed to sense the true nature and purpose of German National Socialism. Occupying themselves with purely theological issues, they had assumed a neutral if not a friendly attitude toward the new political revolution under Hitler.

Now, however, the scales have fallen from Barth's eyes. "My thesis is," he says, "that in the face of National Socialism there is no longer neutrality for the Church today." To assume a position of neutrality is indirectly to sabotage the Christian Church. The Church's neutrality is no longer possible, says Barth, because Nazism is not merely a political system, but also, and more fundamentally, a usurping "anti-Church." "It is impossible to understand National Socialism unless we see it in fact as a *new Islam*, its myth as a new Allah, and Hitler as this new Allah's Prophet."

What, then, must the Church do? First,

says Barth, the Church "should pray for the suppression and casting out of National Socialism," just as in an earlier period it prayed for the extermination of Mohammedanism. To pray for the perpetuation and expansion of Hitlerism is, he says, to deny the Christian Confession and to make nonsense of prayer.

Prayer, however, is but the preface to action. Those who pray to be delivered from Nazism must also "do what is humanly possible towards that for which we pray." Otherwise, one's prayer is useless. This action, furthermore, must be directed toward the creation of a political structure in which the Church can hope to see "a form of life corresponding to this her own form" developed. In a most significant passage, Barth concludes: "Would that the Church had concerned herself much more seriously with the restoration of the just State before matters had reached such a pass that she is concerned for its preservation in *this form*."

That Barth has unfolded the deeper nature of Nazism cannot be denied. Indeed, earlier than most liberal Protestants he sensed the religious menace of the Hitler regime. His proposed social and political strategy of the Church may come as a surprise to those liberals who have usually associated Barth with an

absolutely transcendent theory of the Kingdom of God. In effect as well as in logic, it does contradict the earlier Barth. He, like many a liberal, has had to modify his perspective in light of a revolutionary shift in historical events.

H. Shelton Smith.

BRINTON, HOWARD H., Quaker Education in Theory and Practice. *Pendle Hill Pamphlet Number Nine*. Pendle Hill, Wallingford, Pennsylvania, 1940, 136 pages.

Pendle Hill was founded in 1930 as "a new school for religious and social study." Howard Brinton, well-known as a scholar, teacher, and author, is one of the Directors. In this volume he presents in simple realistic Quaker style the five topics: The Aims of Education, The Nature of Quakerism, Outline History of Quaker Education, Quaker Educational Policies in the Past (the longest section), and The Direction of Further Developments.

"The goal of Quaker education has been, as its history shows, perpetuation of the Quaker way of life." The Quaker "meeting for worship, the meeting for business and the school are special types of community life." "The Inward Light, or Divine Element in the soul . . . is also . . . a super-individual Light which inspires the group as a whole, uniting its members from above." (Preface.)

The Quaker philosophy of education is formulated in the statement: "the goal of life is the centering of the human will in the Divine will" (page 15). It thus finds itself at odds with the pragmatic philosophy of Progressive Education.

Four social doctrines of Quakerism center about the *community* as a closely integrated spiritual and intellectual group of persons; *pacifism* as "creative peaceableness"; *equality* of opportunity in taking part in the worship or business; and *simplicity* as "the absence of superfluity."

The brief outline of the history of Quaker education has four sub-divisions: the Elementary School, the Academy or Secondary School, the College, and the School for Adults. This last stage "began in America with the Haverford summer schools of 1900 and 1904." (page 51).

Ten definite Quaker educational policies in the past are listed as follows:

1. Development of the sense of belonging to the Quaker community.
2. A religiously guarded education.
3. Dedicated and concerned teachers.
4. Non-violent discipline and methods.
5. Appeal to the inward sense of rightness.
6. Equal education of both sexes.
7. Equality in education of races and classes.
8. Moderation in dress, speech, and deportment.
9. Scholastic integrity.
10. Emphasis on practical subjects in the curriculum. (page 53.)

Religion, it is held, "cannot be taught except by the Divine Teacher who works either directly within the soul or through some prophetic individual acting under the sense of direct guidance" (page 57). "Because of the untransferable character of mystical experience there has been a tendency among Friends not to proselytize" (page 63). "The memorizing of Biblical passages was intimately connected with the method of Quaker worship" (page 67). "A child is not naturally good nor is he naturally evil; he is simply innocent" (page 79). Little can be gained by formal moral instruction. Religion is the basis of morality. Religion, as well as science, "was for Quakers empirical and experimental" (page 103). The world of nature has meaning only in relation to the world of spirit.

The dilemma facing Quaker educators today is whether they should throw open their schools and colleges to the public who can pay or keep them as training grounds for the Quaker way of life. Dr. Brinton raises but does not seek to answer this question. He does look to the Quaker school to help develop the Quaker society.

One cannot read this valuable little volume without sensing its power and the very great contribution which Quakerism has made and may make to the solution of national and world problems.

Herman H. Horne.

Constructive Philanthropy, *An Historical Sketch, a Review and an Interpretation of the Golden Rule Foundation*. Published by the Golden Rule Foundation, 60 East 42 St., New York. 36 pages.

This informational pamphlet was prepared by Dr. Charles S. Macfarland, general secretary emeritus of the Federal Council of Churches; chairman of the

advisory committee and a trustee of the Foundation, with which he has been closely connected since its incorporation in 1929.

Sections of the booklet treat of the following topics: "The Inception of the Movement," "Organization," "Technique," "The Experience in Early Years," "The Period of Financial Depression," "Forms of Service," "Continuing and Present Service," "Care and Distribution of Funds," and "Administration."

The introduction says: "The ideal of the Golden Rule Foundation had its inception in the Levitical Law of Judaism, and nearly 2,000 years ago in the Sermon on the Mount. Throughout the intervening centuries, prophets and their followers have sought to incorporate it in human life and relations."

"At the close of its first decade," says the foreword, "it has seemed wise to the Advisory Committee and the Trustees of The Golden Rule Foundation to furnish its constituency and the public with a sketch of historical experience and an interpretative statement in such form that it may be as revealing as possible of the aims and service of the Foundation."

The report is signed by 46 representative leaders in religious, educational and philanthropic work.

C. A. Hawley.



DOUDS, WILLIAM S., *Thy Kingdom Come—Why Not Now?* For sale by the author at St. Petersburg, Fla. 287 pages. \$1.50.

This book, inspired by a book with a similar title but different ending, with the help of E. Stanley Jones and the author's son, attempts to do an important task. It raises the question, why not take Jesus' idea of the Kingdom of God seriously and do something to make it a practical reality. Dr. Jones, who writes the introduction, has told us again and again that the Kingdom of God is the most important message in the world today. In his introduction Dr. Jones holds that the Kingdom idea has been retarded by association in the minds of many with "liberalism" by which he means the social Gospel "which, in turn, was not much more than Socialism

touched with religious emotion." Some form of social control would be good, he argues, but Socialism hasn't recognized collective sin. Three things must be rediscovered and incorporated into the idea of the Kingdom of God. They are: the tragedy of human sin, lack of the sense of the eternal, and the apocalyptic. The older orthodoxy had its limitations also in dealing with the Kingdom idea: it confined its meaning to things heavenly and neglected the present earthly. But the Kingdom comes not by our resources, but by the act of God. It is our part to "receive" not "build" the Kingdom. It may be that the tragic epoch through which we are going may, in an apocalyptic manner, bring in the Kingdom. If this book stimulates to further study in this field, it has accomplished its mission.

C. A. Hawley.



GILSON, ETIENNE, *God and Philosophy.* Yale University Press, 147 pages, \$2.00.

In his Powell lectures, delivered at Indiana University, Professor Etienne Gilson of the Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies in Toronto, discusses "the relation which obtains between our notion of God and the demonstration of his existence." Among the Greek thinkers before Aristotle, the gods were distinct from basic reality—they were beings higher than man upon whom man was dependent. Religion and philosophy were kept in separate compartments. Aristotle identified God with the First Cause with the result that the religious value of God largely disappeared.

It fell to Augustine to try to Christianize the God of Plato and Plotinus, and later, Thomas Aquinas "used the language of Aristotle to say Christian things." As Scholastic philosopher, the author sees in Thomas Aquinas the highest metaphysics where God is the Pure Act of Existence. According to Gilson, succeeding thinkers such as DesCartes, Spinoza, Kant, and Comte represent a defection from attention to pure existence to essences. In this lucid defense of the Thomistic metaphysics he is highly critical of modern philosophy.

Rolland W. Schloerb.

HARRIS, M. LAFAYETTE, *The Voice in the Wilderness. Christopher*, 149 pages, \$1.50.

The author of this collection of addresses, dealing with education and secondarily with Negro education, is the President of Philander Smith College. This important college is doing one of the most useful pieces of educational work for Negroes in the United States. The present volume owes its inspiration to President Hutchins of the University of Chicago. Even the title of this book was suggested by one written by Dr. Hutchins.

Dr. Harris' thesis is the need of creative adjustment, and he feels this keenly for his race. He writes from the psycho-sociological approach in which he sees all life "as ceaseless process." Being very practical and clear-spoken, he makes clear that this thesis is "not to be confused with the concept of instrumentalism in psychology or the social evolution of Spencer as set forth in his *Evolution and Ethics*, or the functionalism of Dewey. It is meant as a basic attitude toward life which enables one to utilize the resources at hand to the best possible advantage." All the rest is commentary—and admirable commentary—on this text with special reference to Negro education. The book deserves a careful consideration, as does the school over which Dr. Harris presides.

C. A. Hawley.

HAYES, DORSHA, *The American Primer. Alliance*, 152 pages, \$1.50.

Russia has its *Soviet Primer*, Germany has its *Nazi Primer*. Now we have the *American Primer*.

All three are designed to make good citizens, according to the concept of citizenship in the respective nation. And all three are very much alike in construction, in the ideologies presented, in the facts offered for consideration, and in their "appeal to reason."

They are alike still further in that all three picture their own country as the greatest among all, and assure readers that true freedom lies in unyielding loyalty to national principles.

In one essential point the *American Primer* differs from the other two: it is based on historical statements which can-

not be challenged; describes conditions which we all know really exist; and presents problems which we all know need to be solved.

Her point of view is that "government is everybody's business," and that intelligent thinking, and acting, on political, social, and economic issues is necessary to maintain democracy, or even freedom.

The book will be read by eighth-grade children and college graduates with the same deep interest; and they will finish the reading determined to "do something" to make a better America.

Laird T. Hites

HOOKE, S. H., AND OTHER LEADING BIBLE SCHOLARS. *The New Testament in Basic English*. A new translation. *Dutton*, 1941, \$2.00.

This new translation was prepared under the direction of S. H. Hooke, Samuel Davidson Professor of Old Testament Studies in the University of London, with the support of other English scholars such as Edwin Smith, I. A. Richards, W. R. Matthews, E. W. Barnes, and Martin Linton-Smith.

As indicated by the title, the language used in this new translation is "Basic English." In addition to 850 words produced by C. K. Ogden of the Orthological Institute, the translators used also 50 special Bible words and 100 extra words which would give "most help in the reading of English verse." So the basic vocabulary for this translation consists of 1,000 words.

This new version is not designed to take the place of the Authorized Version or to compete with it, but "to be used wherever the English language has taken root." If this is the primary objective in the mind of these translators, then their task is well done. They have succeeded in putting the New Testament within reach of a large reading public.

But to those people to whom English is a foreign language, Basic English does not solve all the problems so simply as it sounds. Very often an English word used in the Authorized Version is simple and more intelligible than a phrase in English idiom as used in the new translation. This is because dictionaries give the meaning

of new words but not of idioms. A few samples taken at random will illustrate the point. "*Kneeling down*" (Mk. 1:37), "*seeing he understandeth not what thou sought*" (I Cor. 14:17), and "*hear me*" (I Cor. 14:21) are surely simple and more intelligible to non-English people than "*going down on his knees*," "*seeing that he has not taken in what you are saying*" and "*give ear to me*" as used in the new translation.

Sometimes, due to narrow limits of the word-list, the translators have used words or paraphrases that do not cover exactly the same shades of sense. For example, in the new version "*stitching up*" has been used for "*mending*" in the Authorized Version (Mk. 1:19), "*waste-land*" for "*wilderness*" (Mk. 1:13) and "*if one sense is not given at the same time*" for "*except he interprets*" (I Cor. 14:5).

But as a whole, this is a scholarly piece of work and should prove to be valuable to those with a very limited English vocabulary.

Charles S. Miao.

LANKARD, FRANK G., *The Bible Speaks to Our Generation*, Oxford, 201 pages, \$2.00.

Ministers and teachers are constantly searching for a single volume which will arouse interest in a wider use of the Bible. Most books thus intended are frequently too involved, too sketchy, or are written to earn or justify reputations for scholarship. The author of this book comprehends the contemporary lack of interest in the Bible and recognizes the extent to which the modern mood is responsible for it. To this situation he has addressed himself.

First, let it be said that this is not a "scholar's" book in the sense that it might be intended for those accustomed to dealing with primary sources. It might, however, be of considerable interest to the advanced Bible student who was concerned with the manner and order of presenting illustrative Biblical material.

The changing theological scene is largely of concern to professional religious leaders. Yet the very circumstances compelling this fresh study of the Bible and Christianity in particular are also responsible for the precipitous decline in Biblical interest on the part of the ordinary

church-goer and amateur Biblical student. While the battle is being waged in theological classrooms and cloistered halls the layman wonders what has happened to the interest in Bible study so greatly stressed in his youth.

In a vigorous fashion and with an obvious love of his subject the author briefly introduces his readers to some of the problems of scholarship involved in Biblical study. Then he lets the material perform the service which only the Bible can perform. A reasonable, non-frightening bibliography keeps pace with the development of the theme and is consistent with the author's desire to encourage individuals to use the supplemental material. Key phrases accompany references to chapters or especially significant accounts also serve to arouse interest. Likewise, at the conclusion of each chapter there are questions, which for the most part, are so thoughtfully worded that they are bound to stimulate valuable discussion.

The author has wisely refrained from extensive discussion of the critical aspects of Biblical scholarship and emphasizes the value of the book as a whole. The competition of totalitarian loyalties and the sense of futility over standards in a changing society are met by the ageless convictions of the Old and New Testaments. A judicious selection of illustrative material serves to sustain interest as well as to convince the reader. Sensationalism is lacking but the brevity of the chapters and the correct estimate of the reader's interest begets attention and opens fresh vistas.

The centrality of God in all phases of life and the illumination of this idea by Jesus constitutes the chief emphasis of the book. Awareness of this on the part of the reader would bring release from life's very real but unnecessary tensions, so Dr. Lankard contends. It would also provide an incentive so compelling that a well ordered and integrated life would result. Substantial evidence of this in Biblical characters and scriptural testimony is generously suggested.

Avoiding the apocalyptic nature of the Kingdom of God and emphasizing instead the personal and social ideal as being attainable may cause some lifted eyebrows among theologians. This reviewer believes

that more individuals, those members of adult classes in churches and colleges and wherever they may gather, will profit from the approach of the writer and they will be less inclined toward discouragement from further study.

Those who will be most attracted to this presentation are the individuals who have already developed some measure of religious interest through earlier acquaintance with the Bible. The author seems to presume a fair amount of predisposition toward it. However, as has been the case with countless thousands, Biblical study went only through the Primary department stages for lack of leadership to guide them into the more mature significances. It is the Bible as literature and as purveyor of beauty which the author feels would appeal to mature individuals and he has made a strong case for this. The moral value of the Bible would be appreciated most by those who appreciate its life-enveloping significance. By choosing the avenue of beauty as the way of introduction for those who have had little previous experience or acquaintance with the Bible an effective means is suggested.

Not the least value of the book is the suggesting of ways of circumventing the sections and material which so often stop an eager soul before carrying the search and reading-for-enjoyment very far. Suggested plans for an individual study are outlined, offering a guidebook of numerous tours, depending on the degree of experience the reader possesses or the extent of his initial zeal.

The whole book is one of encouragement to those who would discover the heartening springs in an area of literature and life where both the beginner and the skilled traveller need a guide.

Victor Obenhaus.

MAY, ROLLO, *Springs of Creative Living. Abingdon-Cokesbury*, 271 pages, \$2.00.

"It is our aim" says the author in describing the purpose of this book, "to bring together the two great streams of the understanding of human nature, psychotherapy and religion." Thus he would discover "the springs of creative living." The concepts and methods of both psychology and religion will thus be available to the counselor who seeks to aid persons

facing difficult adjustment problems.

The great need of men, the author contends, is to find *meaning* for their lives "and it is here that religion and depth psychology are in partnership. The field of meaning in life is essentially the religious area, but the techniques of discovering why persons fail to find meaning—why they suffer hindrances, complexes, irrational fears—is the contribution of modern depth psychology."

The author knows his depth psychologists but seems to be especially indebted to Kunkel and his contrast between "ego-centricity" and "object-centricity." And he has read widely in the writings of Berdyaev, Niebuhr, Van Dusen, Wieman, and Tillich. He shares Kunkel's desire to turn the individual's eyes outward so that he may be cured of ego-centricity by contact with reality outside himself—with his actual world and with God. "God is the opposite of a man's ego-centricity, and the human being cannot partake of the health-giving forces of the true God until he transcends the bonds of his narrow egotism and is able to respond to God outside himself."

The book is to be highly commended as a valuable contribution to an understanding of the resources available to the religious counselor in his task of aiding persons achieve a full, free, happy, and useful life.

Charles T. Holman.

MORTON, LAWRENCE, Ruth, a *Children's Opera. Riverside Press, Cincinnati*, \$1.25.

This is a work of unusual interest. The composer has advisedly departed from the titles oratorio and cantata used for biblical themes and has adopted the one less frequently used for a dramatic presentation. One thinks of biblical operas like "Samson and Delilah" of Saint-Saens, or "Salome" of Richard Strauss, except that no provision is made for processional or dance interludes. Like the lyrical operas of Mozart, the composer thinks more of tableaux than of dramatic action although the musical score supplies the dynamic element of the work. For children especially, the stage setting with suitable costumes, scenery and lighting effects vitalizes the story in a manner unequalled

by the music and words alone.

Realizing the vocal and musical limitations of children, the composer wisely puts into his piano setting the full development of the plot. A scoring for small orchestra or perhaps for organ and piano would be even more effective. There is none of the sentimental melodic line with its banal harmonizations one finds too often when composers write down to meet children's requirements. Still pre-adolescent children would find it somewhat bewildering since the tunes of the folk are nearer to their hearts because they are more familiar. Older children should be trained to listen to music vertically as well as horizontally. The effect of music as a whole rather than the appreciation of a simple and an unadorned tune is an aim not to be overlooked.

The narrative follows a dignified recitative with chromatic changes necessitated by the frequent modulations. Whether such a style will become popular is a question which actual testing will demonstrate. There is a suggestion of "modal" writing that provides the archaic or biblical atmosphere. The composer would have done better had he used both modes and the phrases employed in the biblical cantillation.

The solos of Ruth, Orpah, Naomi, Braz and the Head Reaper are simple and effective, and the two-part choral numbers written for sopranos and altos are singable and in good taste. Mr. Morton has added a valuable work to the limited biblical tales scored for children's voices, and conceived in an art form in line with the finest of contemporary musical requirements.

Jacob Singer.

New Methods vs. Old in American Education. An analysis and summary of recent comparative studies, by the Informal Committee Appointed by the Progressive Education Association to Report on Evaluation of Newer Practices in Education, Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1941, 56 pages.

This report is based upon an analysis of "all the more important studies of the past twenty-five years and most of the minor ones." In these studies, attempt has

been made to compare the effectiveness of "new" and "old" methods of instruction. The authors conclude that, "The newer type of curriculum seems to provide some advantages." It appears that the committee does not make any clear-cut distinction between methods and curriculum.

Though expressive descriptive terms are employed to designate the contrasted types of learning situations—"new," "modern," "progressive," vs. "old," "conventional," "conservative," for instance—, no attempt is made to list criteria by which schools or classes may be separated into the two categories. Indeed, though studies are reported which seem to show superiority of the Morrison Plan over more conventional procedure, it is specifically stated that, "This method should not be described as Progressive." Apparently the bases of classification are arbitrary.

R. B. Parsons.

PATTON, LESLIE KARR, *The Purposes of Church-Related Colleges. A Critical Study—a Proposed Program. Teachers College, Columbia University*, 287 pages.

Dr. Patton has published his doctor's dissertation, thereby adding to the new interest in the Liberal Arts College a valuable composite of data. He has traced the purposes of the college from the founding of Harvard in 1636 down to the present period. He analyzes the catalogs of 260 church-related colleges and 52 "independent" colleges to discover the trends in the statements of purpose. Other materials filled out by college presidents also are woven into the texture of the book.

The first half of the book is an array of tables and statistical findings with little interest to the general reader. But with the arrival of Part II, entitled "Major Purposes Emerge—A Basis for Appraisal," the author really touches bottom.

Before the Civil War, the author states that the purposes of liberal arts colleges were:

Preparation for the Ministry
Preparation for leaders in civic affairs
Sharpen the intellect through mental discipline
Teach religion and thereby "save souls"
Discipline the students regarding conduct

Inculcate culture: an emphasis on the classics

The more recent emphases emerge under nine heads: 1. Intellectual Development, 2. The Classical Curriculum, 3. Vocational Preparation, 4. Self-Help Plans, 5. Inculcate the Doctrines of the Related Church, 6. Serve the Community, 7. Citizenship and Social Problems, 8. Attention to the individual, 9. Development of Christian Character.

On the basis of new criteria gleaned from the present social scene and educational writers, the author proceeds to find these emphases inadequate for the church-related college. He feels that the college has lived too long in the "Ivory Tower" and must emerge as a *Creator of Values*. He feels the abstract ideal of "Christian Character" must be reclothed with actual meaning and made to function in line with our ideals of democracy—this is the chief end of the church-related college.

The author believes that the church-related college must redefine its position or be relegated to a less influential level of American institutions. The rapid growth of state-supported universities and colleges, the phenomenal growth of junior colleges, the rising educational costs and declining denominational loyalties place the church-related colleges in a hazardous position. Unless these colleges can give their students a "sense of direction" then they have failed. "Unless the church-related colleges can perform a distinctive function in providing liberal, cultural education which is undergirded with a sound Christian philosophy and which will develop Christian, social leadership, then the churches are simply practicing educational philanthropy which brings no appreciable returns on the investment."

The author locates seven elements in Good Character which the college should develop: 1. Rational Conduct, 2. Self Direction, 3. Socially Desirable Purposes, 4. Carry out one's Purpose Effectively, 5. Integration of Attitudes and Habits, 6. Creative Element, 7. Strength.

In summary, this dissertation has all the earmarks of patient and careful research. It is thoroughgoing and encyclopedic in scope; it is a well finished product. The weaknesses seem to be that nothing compelling and new is presented. His

analysis of Christian Character is minute but it does not point out any new or helpful approach to the problem. No experimental procedure is suggested.

Our most urgent need for the church-related college is a blue-print of action, a guide for busy administrators who can use it and more quickly find what it is all about and set some wheels in motion for the recreation of Christian living on the campus. Dr. Patton sets the stage for this blue-print but he does not describe its process. Perhaps he will follow with such a blue-print and fulfill the great need of our drifting colleges.

L. L. Leftwich.



Science, Philosophy and Religion: A Symposium. Published by the Conference on Science, Philosophy and Religion in Their Relation to the Democratic Way of Life, Inc., New York, 1941, 443 pages, \$1.50.

The feeling has been widespread that these major fields of thought have, in the United States at least, been too much shut up in water-tight compartments, each going its own way with little concern for the others or for life as a whole. It was a stroke of genius to bring together in one conference leading exponents in these three great disciplines to consider some of their interrelations.

Louis Finkelstein, President of the Jewish Theological Seminary, who is perhaps the leading spirit in this enterprise, says that the aim of the conference was to consider some of the "timeless ethical values" and to help each other "see our particular fields from the perspective of the whole of modern learning." He points out that unity, not conformity, in seeking truth is the only protection, humanly speaking, against Totalitarianism. "While men of affairs are directing their efforts at safeguarding our national boundaries and our traditional institutions, it is appropriate that we concentrate on the problems of modern society at its roots, in the intellectual life."

The papers included in this volume were prepared for this initial Conference. The twenty-four addresses are grouped under four headings: The Social Sciences and Humanities; Philosophy; The Natural

Sciences; and Religion and the Philosophy of Education.

In any book made up of addresses there is necessarily a certain unevenness and lack of unity. It is impossible to do justice to all in a brief review but every paper is important and stimulating.

At least two ideas give a real thread of unity to the volume: "Democracy is on trial for its life" and there is terrible need of the "prompt realization . . . of the extraordinary character of the contemporary crisis of our culture and society." The other is that it is essential to bring all the light and truth of science, philosophy and religion into closer unity in promoting the democratic way of life. This way of life, it seems crystal clear to the religious leaders at least, is based on God the Father of all mankind.

It is reiterated that there is no quarrel between science, philosophy and religion. Each is seeking the same truth in its own way. But "science has often neglected the elements of value and feeling" and the other two often lose contact with reality.

Dr. Adler defines positivists as those who deny philosophy and religion. He sets down eight propositions defining religion and eight defining philosophy, the denial of any one of which, he says, denies all. He says the "human intellect" cannot attain religion without God's revelation. What is human intellect if it does not necessarily include the sense of God? He also makes religion dependent on "the truths of faith" as over against reason. Here are two perilous dualisms. And is science not as dependent on faith or assumption as religion? He says philosophy is "superior" to science and religion is "superior" to philosophy. What does "superior" mean? His only hope is medievalism and a second Aquinas or Maimonides!

Prof. Chapman shows clearly that the choice is totalitarianism or democracy. The latter is a continuous struggle for progressive fulfillment. Incidentally he quotes historians to show that capitalism was encouraged by the Papacy and is not an outgrowth of Protestantism.

Douglas C. Macintosh is helpful in defining logic as valid thinking; in his analysis of intuition, though he makes it very inclusive; and his interpretation of

"divine." "Certain directions of spiritual effort are universally worthy of the absolute devotion of persons, and . . . are, as such, divine . . . The process of realizing such qualitatively divine values is a qualitatively divine process." However he makes one of the "specific conditions of spiritual adjustment" to be the "surrender of one's will." Just what would a human being be who surrendered his will? Certainly not one who wills to do and dare for God.

One of the dangers of religion according to Dr. Overstreet is to claim absolute finality and an idea of God that is finished and final. What is necessary is "a frame of reference that is more than human" and for a religion that is lived in one's everyday life.

One feels in Einstein's paper that though, probably from early experience in old-fashioned orthodox churches, he rejects religious terms and perhaps even the word God, that he is yet nearer the essence of religion than many who bandy pious phrases. His concept of the cosmos implies Something very near the liberal's apprehension of God. He might find himself wonderfully at home in a liberal church with a vital program.

The final section is not very unified but it has able articles on such topics as education, religion, archaeology and the New Testament in their relation to the world of today.

This volume is not for those who are looking for light and amusing reading, though it is not without its humor. It is commended to all who are seriously interested in the great matters with which it attempts to deal.

A. J. W. Myers.



The White House Conference on Children in a Democracy. *United States Department of Labor, Washington*, 125 plus 85 pages, paper bound.

This is the fourth in a series of conferences. A vast amount of work was done in preparation by research and study groups. They were essentially citizens representing all walks of life. The mechanics provided for group meetings and general sessions. These are some of the group interests: The family; economics; housing;

religion; health; leisure; child labor; youth employment.

It is surprising to find that one quarter million of mothers each year, that is one in eight, have no medical care at childbirth and that half the children each year, 1,000,000 of them, are in families without adequate income or on relief. Nearly half the families in the nation in the boom years had not sufficient income for proper diet.

The general report with findings and resolutions comprises the last 85 pages. It is interesting to religious workers to find this citizens conference place the emphasis on the family as the supreme educational and character forming agency (page 90). There is a call for the reexamination of the secondary school program in view of the fact that there are over six million in them and forty-one million in the country under 18 years of age (one-third of the total population), and that one-third of the unemployed are from 15-25 years of age. And yet child labor is a serious problem—until the Emergency.

These are some of the interesting findings in regard to religion: "Parents, teachers, and others responsible for guiding children should be ever alert to the importance to the child of facing specific life situations." They should give "whole-hearted recognition and appreciation of the fundamental place of religion . . ." "Religion should be one of the unifying factors" and "Practical steps should be taken to make more available to children . . . the resources of religion as an important factor in the democratic way of life . . ." (pages 30-31).

A. J. W. Myers.

Briefer Mention

BOLE, S. J., *The Battlefield of Faith*. College Press, University Park, Iowa. 320 pages.

The author, a doctor of philosophy, is professor of biology in John Fletcher College, Iowa. He was reared as a natural scientist, passed through a conversion experience, and now approaches science as a simple believer in Jesus. Evolution is, he believes, an incorrect hypothesis. God operates directly in His world.

From every field of science, organic and inorganic, Professor Bole has assembled material for his book. It is rich in the very plethora of materials. Each section is followed by well-

organized questions designed to stimulate thoughtfulness.

A reader who is a naturalist, a higher critic, and at the same time feels himself to be a sincere Christian, wonders whether the antithesis Dr. Bole depicts is inevitable. Perhaps evolution may be God's way of working after all.—L.T.H.

CHALMERS, ALLAN KNIGHT, *Candles in the Wind*. Scribners, 224 pages, \$2.00.

The minister of the Broadway Tabernacle in New York writes an inspiring book on the meaning of the religious life. It is a reasonable life, though many aspects of it cannot be "proved." It is a hard life requiring courage and persistence, but it is rewarding. Dr. Chalmers pretty well achieves his purpose of producing a feeling of belief in "the true light which lighteth every man that cometh into the world."—L.T.H.

CROWTHER, RUTH, *Manly Manners*. Associated Authors, 113 pages, \$1.35.

Probably all parents are looking for some painless way to teach their children the thoughtful courtesies which make life so much more pleasant for us all. This book is an attempt to solve the problem through verse and picture. A wide variety of situations is covered, with an emphasis on behavior at the table and personal cleanliness. Much of the value of the book is lost, however, through the use of vocabulary and sentence structure far beyond the level of the child for whom the book is intended.—G.S.S.

JENNESS, MARY, *We Explore the Prophets*. Morehouse-Gorham, 70 cents. Procedure Guide, 20 cents.

This work book, based on the author's "Men Who Stood Alone," is replete with suggestions for the conduct of a church school class. Many devices are used to awaken study of the prophets, and many doors are opened to enable the class to discuss and to apply the experience of the prophets to the modern situation. Each page of the work book is perforated so that a class may use as much or as little of the material as desired in preparing its own book. Teachers who will not too slavishly or mechanically follow its directions will find many helpful suggestions in this material.—R.W.S.

KLABER, FLORENCE W., *Joseph—The Story of Twelve Brothers*. Beacon Press, 63 pages, \$1.00.

The story of Joseph and his brothers has been told many times and in many ways, but it has always held the interest of children. Here it is told again, simply and clearly, as an entertaining story for children of seven or eight years of age. Mrs. Klaber has followed the Biblical account, simplifying where necessary, and adding details of life in that time to enrich the meanings. The excellent illustrations add much to the story. The old familiar story has lost nothing, and has gained much, in the re-telling.—G.S.S.

MACFARLAND, CHARLES S., *Current Religious Thought: A Digest*. Revell, 185 pages, \$1.50.

A digest is given of 45 of the most important recent books on religion. The volumes represent many and divergent points of view. This series of reviews of current religious thought makes clear that the mind of the church is not static. It is in this very freedom of thought and expression that our hope lies. God marches on and so must those who would keep in step with him. The author says that as he worked over these books the Apostle's words kept recurring, "We know in part" and the conviction that "God, too, is a thinker." He warns writers and teachers from being committed entirely to one position. The digests are fair and the critical notes keen.—*A.J.W.M.*



MASON, BERNARD S., *Jud Goes Camping*. Barnes, 85 pages, \$2.00.

Two eleven-year-old boys, on a camping trip with an experienced woodsman, learn things that many another boy would like to know. They learn how to make fires, and how to cook; how to fashion cooking utensils, and how to make a balsam bed; how to keep their water cool, and their food safe from animals; and many other things. They learn the habits of birds and animals, after they have learned how to observe them. Best of all, they have a good time, and so will other boys who read about their experiences.—*G.S.S.*



MOSELEY, FLORENCE A. and J. EDWARD, *Using Drama in the Church*. Bethany Press, 90 pages.

Classes in summer young people's conferences and in other leadership training groups will find this text useful in developing a better understanding of the use of drama in the church. The five chapters deal with the history of religious drama, with the qualities needed by directors and actors, and with the relation of the drama to worship. Selected lists of plays for use in the church are included in the book.—*R.W.S.*



The National Council, Protestant Episcopal Church, 281 Fourth Ave., New York, have just published the following units for the church school: The Youngest Ones (Nursery); The Kindergarten in the Church, Homes and Parents, God Caring through People, Celebrating Christmas, Celebrating Thanksgiving, Play and Friends, and Getting Acquainted with the Church—all for the Kindergarten; We enjoy Easter, We prepare for Christmas, We Learn How the Boy Jesus Lived, and We Live Together, for grades I and II. These are a far cry from the old Uniform Lessons, and the Episcopal church is to be commended for these excellent courses which are suitable for any denomination.

PRATT, ALICE DAV, *Animal Babies*. Beacon Press, 148 pages, \$1.50.

Animals, and especially baby animals, have always had a fascination for children. For the six- or seven-year-old child who does not have pets this book will come as close to a substitute as it is possible to achieve. The child who does have pets will appreciate much more the meaning of their behaviour. The stories will interest the child, and the facts contained within them may be expected to stimulate that mental alertness and curiosity which is so important. The parent will find the book a very useful and natural approach to sex instruction.—*G.S.S.*



PRATT, JOHN BARNES, *Present Day Hymns And Why They Were Written*. A. S. Barnes, 113 pages, \$1.00.

The author of this book has procured from the writers of thirty hymns written during the past three decades short accounts of the circumstances under which their hymns were composed. As is to be expected, nothing extraordinary or dramatic can be reported regarding the composition of many of them, but the meaning of each hymn is enhanced as one has this added understanding from the experiences of modern hymnists.—*R.W.S.*



RODGERS, EDITH C., *Discussion of Holidays in the Later Middle Ages*. Columbia University Press, 147 pages, \$1.50.

During this time there were at least 40 holidays, or rather holidays, besides Sundays and other feasts, not less than one holiday every three days. "What stand the Church took in respect to holidays, what forces both within and without its circle attacked this position during the three hundred and twenty-odd years between the opening of the thirteenth century and the Reformation, and what attempts were made to stem the onslaught of criticism directed against such holidays form the subject of this enquiry." The whole study is thoroughly documented and there are sixteen pages of references, chiefly original sources.—*A.J.W.M.*



STEVENS, BERTHA, *How Miracles Abound*. John Day, 200 pages, \$2.50.

Children eight and nine years of age are capable of experiencing wonder and awe in the presence of nature, and of understanding a good deal about it. To help leaders of such children guide them into these experiences is the purpose of this book. Ten examples from nature form the chapters of the book; four of them inorganic—a star, a magnet, a salt crystal, and a dewdrop. Six are taken from the organic world—a bean, a flower, a tree, a snail shell, a goldfish, and a human hand. All illustrate order, law, and beauty, and inspire wonder and appreciation.

The book is prepared for teachers of children. Useful suggestions on method, and additional materials, are suggested.—*L.T.H.*

THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ASSOCIATION STANDING COMMITTEES

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

ERNEST J. CHAVE, Associate Professor
of Religious Education, University of
Chicago, Chairman.

MORTON M. BERMAN, Rabbi, Temple
Isaiah Israel, Chicago.

HEDLEY S. DIMOCK, Dean, George Wil-
liams College, Chicago.

KENNETH L. HEATON, Professor, North-
western University.

LEO L. HONOR, Executive Director,
Board of Jewish Education, Chicago.

VERGIL E. LOWDER, Minister, New First
Congregational Church, Chicago.

OTTO MAYER, Director of Research, In-
ternational Council of Religious Edu-
cation, Chicago.

RUTH SHRIVER, Board of Education,
Church of the Brethren, Elgin, Ill.

CENTRAL PLANNING COMMITTEE

HARRISON S. ELLIOTT, Union Theological
Seminary, New York City, Chairman.

STEWART G. COLE, Service Bureau for
Intercultural Education, New York.

SAMUEL L. HAMILTON, New York Uni-
versity.

C. IVAR HELLSTROM, Riverside Church,
New York.

ALEXANDER M. DUSHKIN, Executive Di-
rector, Jewish Education Committee,
New York City.

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

For list of members of this committee see the inside front cover.

Note: The officers and committee chairmen act as ex-officio members of each of
the standing committees.

Religious Education Association

OFFICERS

Honorary President—George A. Coe, Professor (Retired), Evanston, Ill.

President—Harrison S. Elliott, Union Theological Seminary, New York City.

Vice-Presidents—Leo L. Honor, Director, Board of Jewish Education, Chicago; James S. Seneker, Southern Methodist University, Dallas; Erwin L. Shaver, Division of Christian Education of the Congregational and Christian Churches, Boston.

Treasurer—Weightstill Woods, Attorney, Chicago.

Recording Secretary—Ross W. Snyder, Professor, Chicago Theological Seminary.

Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Board—Ernest J. Chave, Associate Professor of Religious Education, University of Chicago.

CHAIRMEN OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Editorial—Frank M. McKibben, Professor of Religious Education, Northwestern University.

Central Planning Committee—Harrison S. Elliott.

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Edna L. Acheson—Park Central Presbyterian Church, Syracuse, N.Y.

Morton M. Berman—Rabbi, Temple Isaiah Israel, Chicago.

W. Dyer Blair—International Council of Religious Education, New York office.

Edward W. Blakeman—Counselor in Religious Education, University of Michigan.

William C. Bower—Professor of Religious Education, University of Chicago.

Adelaide Case—Professor of Religious Education, Teachers College, Columbia University.

Israel S. Chipkin—Associate Director, Jewish Education Committee, New York City.

Stewart G. Cole—Service Bureau for Intercultural Education, New York City.

Hedley S. Dimock, Dean, George Williams College, Chicago.

Alexander M. Dushkin—Executive Director, Jewish Education Committee, New York.

Miriam Ephraim—Educational Secretary, Y.M.H.A., Pittsburgh.

S. P. Franklin—School of Education, University of Pittsburgh.

Emanuel Gamoran—Educational Director, Commission on Jewish Education, Cincinnati.

Samuel H. Goldenson—Rabbi, Congregation Emanu-El, New York City.

Samuel L. Hamilton—Professor of Education, New York University.

Hugh Hartshorne, Research Associate in Religion, Yale University.

Kenneth L. Heaton—Professor, Northwestern University.

C. Ivar Hellstrom—Minister of Education, Riverside Church, New York.

George Johnson—Professor of Education, Catholic University of America.

Philip C. Jones, Minister, Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York City.

Ernest W. Kuebler—Secretary, Department of Religious Education, American Unitarian Association, Boston.

Isaac Landman—Director, Academy for Adult Jewish Education, New York City.

Paul Lambert—Professor, Y.M.C.A. College, Springfield, Mass.

Vergil E. Lowder—Minister, New First Congregational Church, Chicago.

E. R. MacLean—Director of Religious Education, United Church of Canada, Toronto.

Victor E. Marriott—Director of Religious Education, Chicago Congregational Union.

Shailer Mathews—Dean Emeritus, University of Chicago Divinity School.

Otto Mayer—Director of Research, International Council of Religious Education, Chicago.

Rhoda McCulloch—Editor-in-Chief of Publications, National Board, Y.W.C.A., New York.

Raymond McLain, President, Transylvania University, Lexington, Kentucky.

Thornton W. Merriam—Director of Board of Religion, Northwestern University.

J. Quintar Miller—Field Secretary, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, New York City.

Alberta Munkres—Professor, Cornell College, Mount Vernon, Iowa.

A. J. W. Myers—Professor, Religious Education, Hartford Seminary Foundation.

Ruth Shriver, Board of Education, Church of the Brethren, Elgin, Ill.

H. Shelton Smith—Professor, Divinity School, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina.

J. Edward Sprout—Program Executive, National Council of Y.M.C.A.'s, New York City.

Robert J. Taylor—Professor, University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

Thomas H. West—Attorney, Chicago.

Frank Wilson—Professor of Religion, Lincoln University, Pa.

Ray O. Wyland—Director of Education and Relationships, Boy Scouts of America, New York City.

7